

Middlesex University Research Repository

An open access repository of

Middlesex University research

<http://eprints.mdx.ac.uk>

Castaldo, Christopher A. (2015) The grammar of justification: the doctrines of Peter Martyr Vermigli and John Henry Newman and their ecumenical implications. PhD thesis, Middlesex University / London School of Theology. [Thesis]

Final accepted version (with author's formatting)

This version is available at: <https://eprints.mdx.ac.uk/15772/>

Copyright:

Middlesex University Research Repository makes the University's research available electronically.

Copyright and moral rights to this work are retained by the author and/or other copyright owners unless otherwise stated. The work is supplied on the understanding that any use for commercial gain is strictly forbidden. A copy may be downloaded for personal, non-commercial, research or study without prior permission and without charge.

Works, including theses and research projects, may not be reproduced in any format or medium, or extensive quotations taken from them, or their content changed in any way, without first obtaining permission in writing from the copyright holder(s). They may not be sold or exploited commercially in any format or medium without the prior written permission of the copyright holder(s).

Full bibliographic details must be given when referring to, or quoting from full items including the author's name, the title of the work, publication details where relevant (place, publisher, date), pagination, and for theses or dissertations the awarding institution, the degree type awarded, and the date of the award.

If you believe that any material held in the repository infringes copyright law, please contact the Repository Team at Middlesex University via the following email address:

eprints@mdx.ac.uk

The item will be removed from the repository while any claim is being investigated.

See also repository copyright: re-use policy: <http://eprints.mdx.ac.uk/policies.html#copy>

The Grammar of Justification: The Doctrines of Peter Martyr Vermigli and John Henry Newman and Their Ecumenical Implications

A Thesis submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

by

Christopher A. Castaldo

Middlesex University

Supervised at London School of Theology

August 2014

Abstract

Christopher Albert Castaldo, “The Grammar of Justification: The Doctrines of Peter Martyr Vermigli and John Henry Newman and Their Ecumenical Implications” (Ph.D. thesis, Middlesex University/London School of Theology, 2014).

This thesis analyzes the doctrines of justification in the Roman Catholic John Henry Newman (1801-1890) and the Reformed Protestant Peter Martyr Vermigli (1499-1562), examining their historical contexts and respective works. Recognition of their common concerns, common commitments, different commitments, and different conclusions provide insight into agreements and variances between Roman Catholics and Reformed Protestants in contemporary ecumenical dialogue.

We conclude that many of the classic discrepancies between Roman Catholics and Reformed Protestants are not as irreconcilable as they may appear at first glance. We recognize, for example, a common commitment to union with Christ by the Holy Spirit, a union that imparts twofold righteousness by divine initiative. This righteousness grows in an internal habit of grace, producing virtue as it reaches toward holiness. Such works are a necessary part of justification, which pleases God and receives his favor in the form of rewards. Despite this convergence, however, some irreconcilable differences remain. Most fundamental is the question of justification’s formal cause, whether divine forgiveness is ultimately based upon an internal work of the Spirit or the forensic imputation of Christ’s righteousness. There is also the basic difference of how righteousness is appropriated, by means of faith alone through the sacrament of baptism. Finally, there is disagreement over perseverance of faith, whether Christians are eternally secure in their justification.

In addition to advancing scholarship on several issues associated with Newman’s and Vermigli’s doctrines of justification and illuminating reasons and attendant circumstances for conversion across the Tiber, the overall conclusions of this study offer a broader range of soteriological possibilities to ecumenical dialogue among Roman Catholics and Protestants by clarifying the common ground to which both traditions may lay claim.

Acknowledgements

The completion of this thesis would not have happened without encouragement from several friends and colleagues, namely Dr. Michael McDuffee, Dr. E. David Cook, Dr. Timothy George, Msgr. Dr. John Cihak, Dr. Jerry Root, and Dr. Lon Allison.

I am indebted to the staff at Buswell Library in Wheaton, particularly Gregory Morrison for helping me obtain several monographs. I am grateful for Gianni Saillen for providing a visit to the *Villa I Tatti* in Florence, Italy to enjoy its collection of Vermigliana. Likewise, I am thankful for Drs. Damon McGraw and Kevin Mongrain of the National Institute for Newman Studies for graciously providing full access to the Newman Knowledge Kiosk.

I am especially grateful for Dr. Frank James III who offered me valuable input at the outset of my research and who has been available to answer questions along the way. Likewise, I am indebted to Dr. John Patrick Donnelly S.J. for reading nearly every chapter and offering incisive feedback. I am also thankful for Dr. Thomas Sheridan S.J. who not only took time to discuss Newman's doctrine of justification, but also offered insight into its significance for Christian life and ministry. And thanks to Kirk Vukonich, Susanne Calhoun, and Yousaf Sadiq for graciously reading and copyediting portions of the thesis.

I can't adequately express gratitude for my supervisor, Professor Anthony Lane, whose patience, encouragement, and example of academic rigor are gifts for which I will always be grateful.

Finally, I thank my dear wife, Angela, whose unfailing love and support has enabled me to take up and read, and our children, Luke, Philip, Simeon, Aliza, and David Malachi for understanding how important this project has been for Daddy.

List of Abbreviations

<i>Apo</i>	Newman, John Henry. <i>Apologia pro vita sua: being a history of his religious opinions</i> (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1882)
<i>AW</i>	Newman, John Henry. <i>Autobiographical Writings</i> , ed. Henry Tristram (London: Sheed and Ward, 1956)
<i>CCC</i>	<i>Catechism of the Catholic Church</i> , ed. 2 (Citta del vaticano: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 1997)
<i>ID</i>	McGrath, Alister E. <i>Iustitia Dei: A History of the Christian Doctrine of Justification</i> , 3 rd ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005)
<i>Jfc</i>	Newman, John Henry. <i>Lectures on the Doctrine of Justification</i> , 3 rd ed. (London: Rivington, 1874)
<i>PMI</i>	McNair, Philip. <i>Peter Martyr in Italy: An Anatomy of Apostasy</i> (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1967)
<i>PMR</i>	The Peter Martyr Reader, ed. John Patrick Donnelly, Frank A. James, III, and Joseph C. McLelland (Kirkville, MO: Truman State University Press, 1999)
<i>PPS</i>	Newman, John Henry. <i>Parochial and Plain Sermons</i> (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1997)
<i>Romanos</i>	Vermigli, Pietro Martire. <i>In epistolam S. Pauli apostoli ad Romanos D. Petri Martyris Vermilii Florentini, professoris divinarum literarum in schola Tigurina, commentarii doctissimi, cum tractatione perutili rerum & locorum, qui ad eam epistolam pertinent</i> (Basel: Apud Petrum Perna, 1560)
<i>JD</i>	The Lutheran World Federation and The Roman Catholics Church, <i>Joint Declaration on the Doctrine of Justification</i> . (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000)

Table of Contents

Abstract	i
Acknowledgements	ii
Abbreviations	iii
Table of Contents	iv
 Introduction	 1
 Chapter 1. Background to Peter Martyr’s Doctrine of Justification	 10
A. The Study of Peter Martyr Vermigli	10
B. The “Quite Learned Man” from Italy	16
C. The Italian Renewal Movement Called “ <i>Evangelisme</i> ”	19
D. Religious Discourse in Italy: 1490-1530	22
E. Italian <i>Evangelisme</i> and the Doctrine of Justification	27
F. Vermigli’s Doctrine of Justification	33
G. Peter Martyr at Oxford	38
H. Peter Martyr’s <i>Locus</i> on Justification	44
I. Conclusion	48
 Chapter 2. Peter Martyr Vermigli’s Doctrine of Justification	 50
A. Theological Contours of Vermigli’s Doctrine of Justification	50
B. Regeneration and Pneumatic Renewal	53
C. The Forensic Framework of Justification	61
D. Faith alone	65
E. Justification’s Formal Cause and the <i>Duplex Iustitia</i>	75
F. Conclusion	85
 Chapter 3. Newman’s Historical Background	 88
A. The Study of John Henry Newman	88
B. The World of John Henry Newman	93
C. Newman the Calvinist	98
D. Newman Questions His Evangelical Assumptions	101
E. “Shreds and Tatters” of Evangelicalism	105
F. The Making of Newman’s <i>Via Media</i>	107

G. The Oxford or Tractarian Movement	112
H. The <i>Lectures on the Doctrine of Justification</i>	119
I. Conclusion	126
Chapter 4. John Henry Newman's Doctrine of Justification	128
A. Theological Contours of Newman's Doctrine of Justification	128
B. Incarnation	133
C. The Sacramental Framework of Justification	136
D. Justifying Presence	140
E. The Christocentric Focus of Justification	142
F. Pneumatic, Resurrected Life	146
G. The Formal Cause of Justification	149
H. Conclusion	160
Chapter 5. A Comparison of Newman and Vermigli on the Doctrine of Justification	161
I. Common Concerns	161
A. Newman and Vermigli in Conversation	161
B. Works Righteousness	163
C. Cheap Grace	165
D. Holding Forensic and Actual Righteousness Close Together	166
E. Distinguishing Forensic and Actual Righteousness	168
II. Common Commitments	169
A. An Augustinian Hamatology	169
B. Union with Christ	171
C. Need for Forensic Imputation	172
D. The Gift of the Holy Spirit and Manifestation of "Works"	175
E. <i>Duplex Iustitia</i>	178
III. Different Commitments	181
A. Sacramental Framework of Justification	181
B. Faith Alone	182
IV. Different Conclusions	185
A. Formal Cause	185
B. <i>Habitus</i>	190
C. Perseverance	191

V. Conclusion	193
Chapter 6. Justification in Contemporary Roman Catholic and Reformed Theology	194
A. Justification in Contemporary Ecumenical Focus	194
B. Human Powerlessness & Divine Initiative	197
C. Justification's Formal Cause	200
D. Concupiscence or Sin?	206
E. Faith Alone and Works	208
F. Assurance of Faith	212
G. The Role of Merit	213
H. Conclusion	215
Bibliography	218

Introduction

Understanding the precise relationship between justification and sanctification has been a *crux theologorum* in the history of Christian thought, a challenge that we have inherited from the texts with which we build our faith. Paul the Apostle, for instance, asserts, “For by works of the law no human being will be justified in his sight, since through the law comes knowledge of sin” (Romans 3:20). But then, in the same biblical canon, we read James where it states, “You see that a person is justified by works and not by faith alone” (James 2:24).

After sixteen centuries, the need to reconcile these statements in a doctrine of justification rose to universal proportions in the Protestant Reformations.¹ Diarmaid MacCulloch is correct to caution against using the word “Protestant” as a simple designation for “sympathizers with reform in the first half of the sixteenth century, since inclinations toward renewal were shared by Roman Catholics.”² In this vein, we must also recognize that Protestants initially understood themselves to be working for reform *within* the Roman Catholic Church.³ Our first chapter, which examines the movement of evangelical renewal on the Italian peninsula, will illustrate this phenomenon.⁴

The second historiographical caution is to distinguish the writings of individual reformers (particularly those of the first and second generations) from the development of confessional documents which reflect the consensus view of the Reformed churches later in

¹ Carter Lindberg, for example, provides reasons for the plurality of Reformation movements in his classic text *The European Reformations*, 2nd Edition. (Malden: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010), 11-22. For a full treatment of the Reformation debates on justification and the Catholic response, see Alister E. McGrath’s magisterial work, *Iustitia Dei: A History of the Christian Doctrine of Justification*, 3rd ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 208-357. Berndt Hamm evaluates a variety of positions on the doctrine of justification among the first and second generations of Reformers in his

² MacCulloch prefers the word “evangelical” as a more indicative description of the movement’s beliefs and also the nomenclature of the period. *The Reformation: A History*. (New York: Viking, 2003), xviii.

³ So David Steimetz asserts, “It is important to remember that the Reformation began as an intra-Catholic debate.” “The Intellectual Appeal of the Reformation,” *Theology Today* 57 (2001) 459-472 (459). McGrath explains that for early Reformed theologians, the driving concern was to renew life and morals of the church and of individual Christians. *Iustitia Dei*, 248-258.

⁴ Martin Bucer’s ongoing attempts at rapprochement into the early 1540s are a prime example from outside of Italy. Martin Greschat, *Martin Bucer: A Reformer and His Times* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2004), 168-205.

the century. David Fink addresses this distinction by proposing that it is helpful to understand the sixteenth century *Konfessionsbildung* process as having occurred in two distinct waves,⁵ first in 1528-1537⁶ and then between 1559-1577.⁷ While Fink is careful to affirm that the second wave is in basic continuity with the first, he argues convincingly that it is in the latter period that a clear consensus position on the doctrine of justification emerged in terms of a formulaic explanation of forensic imputation.⁸

Even though confessional statements took time to develop, there appears to have been basic conceptual agreement on the doctrine of justification among the earliest generations of Reformers. According to Alister McGrath, the leading characteristics of the Protestant outlook on justification were threefold: First, justification involves a “forensic *declaration* that the Christian is righteous,” that is, a change in one’s legal status before God (as opposed to a process of internal renewal by which one is *made* righteous). Second, there is a “deliberate and systematic distinction” between the forensic activity of justification and the internal process of sanctification or regeneration. Third, “justifying righteousness or the formal cause of justification” is alien, external, and imputed.⁹

On the other side of the ecclesial divide, the Roman Catholic Church responded to Protestant arguments by convening the Council of Trent (1545-1563) where it defined its

⁵ David C. Fink. “Was There a Reformation Doctrine of Justification?” *Harvard Theological Review* 103 (2010) 205-235.

⁶ Ten Theses of Bern (1528), Tetrapolitan Confession (1530), First Confession of Basel (1534), First Helvetic Confession (1536), Lausanne Articles (1536), The Ten Articles (1536), and The Geneva Confession (1536).

⁷ French Confession (1559/71), Scots Confession (1560), Belgic Confession (1561), Heidelberg Catechism (1563), and the Second Helvetic Confession (1566).

⁸ Fink explains the time frame in which Reformed theology reached a “two-state model” on justification, that is, the notion that justification involves the *iustitia Christi imputata* in addition to the remission (or non-imputation) of sin. In addition to analyzing Reformed confessions, Fink also explains how Lutheran confessional statements unfold in a parallel chronology. Fink, “Was There a Reformation Doctrine?,” 235.

⁹ Alister McGrath, “Forerunners of the Reformation? A Critical Examination of the Evidence for Precursors of the Reformation Doctrines of Justification,” *Harvard Theological Review* 75 (1982):219-242; (idem, *Iustitia Dei*, 212-213). Berndt Hamm’s conclusions support this taxonomy vis-à-vis the formal cause (192), imputation (194), and distinction of justification from sanctification (196). *The Reformation of Faith in the Context of Late Medieval Theology and Piety: Essays by Berndt Hamm* (ed. Robert J. Bast. Leiden: Brill, 2004). For the historical antecedents to these characteristics, see A.N.S. Lane, *Justification by Faith in Catholic-Protestant Dialogue: An Evangelical Assessment* (London: T&T Clark, 2002), 138-140.

doctrine in its *Decree on Justification* (1547). Rejecting the Protestant view of “faith alone” grounded in the forensic imputation of Christ’s righteousness, the Roman Church chose to emphasize the “process” of justification whereby the gift of righteousness is internally “infused” through her Sacraments, a process expressed in moral virtues and good works as the necessary condition for man’s final absolution.¹⁰ As for the contemporary significance of Trent’s teaching, Avery Cardinal Dulles, S.J., explains that the “theology of justification in Roman Catholic teaching has undergone no dramatic changes since the Council of Trent.”¹¹

When comparing the Roman Catholic and Reformed Protestant doctrines of justification, there is recognition that the fundamental difference between the two positions comes down to the “formal cause.”¹² It is an intrinsic component of a particular subject,¹³ that which makes it what it is¹⁴ or as John Henry Newman suggests in his extended appendix on the topic, it comprises a subject’s basic constitution.¹⁵ Taking its cues from Aristotle’s list of four “causes,”¹⁶ the Council of Trent explicated justification’s formal cause as follows:

¹⁰ Chapter seven of the *Decree on Justification* explains “What the justification of the sinner is and what are its causes.” *Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils*, ed. Norman P. Tanner, vol. 2 (London: Sheed & Ward, 1990), 673.

¹¹ Avery Cardinal Dulles, S.J. “Justification in Contemporary Theology,” in *Justification by Faith: Lutherans and Catholics in Dialogue VII*, ed. H. George Anderson et al. (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1985), 256. According to A. N. S. Lane, even if the *Joint Declaration on the Doctrine of Justification* (1999) is taken into account, the positive exposition of the Tridentine decree remains incompatible with a Protestant understanding, even though the gap is narrower than it was previously. Anthony N. S. Lane, *Justification by Faith*, 223.

¹² Edward Yarnold, “*Duplex iustitia*: The Sixteenth Century and the Twentieth,” in *Christian Authority: Essays in Honour of Henry Chadwick*, ed. G. R. Evans (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1988), 208; Lane, *Justification by Faith*, 72; John Henry Newman, *Lectures on the Doctrine of Justification*, 3rd ed. (London: Rivingtons, 1874), 343; Peter Martyr Vermigli, *Predestination and Justification: Two Theological Loci*, trans. and ed. Frank A. James, III, *The Peter Martyr Library* 8 (Kirkville, MO: Truman State University Press, 2003), 159; Peter Toon, *Evangelical Theology, 1833-1856: A Response to Tractarianism* (London: Marshall, Morgan and Scott, 1979), 145-146.

¹³ Yarnold, *Duplex iustitia*, 208.

¹⁴ Lane, *Justification by Faith*, 70.

¹⁵ The First Edition of Newman’s *Lectures* (1838) contained a 52 page appendix titled “On the formal cause of Justification” [Newman, *Jfc.*, 1st ed., 391-443]. The 61 page appendix of the Third Edition is essentially the same apart from a few explanatory notes (on pages 343, 348-349, and 353).

¹⁶ In seeking to explain the “why” of a thing, that is, its cause, Aristotle describes changes of movement in terms of its material, formal, efficient, and final cause. *Physics* 2:3 trans. Philip H. Wicksteed and Francis M. Cornford. Loeb Classical Library. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1968), 1:128-31.

Finally, the one formal cause [*unica formalis causa*] is the justness of God: not that by which he himself is just, but that by which he makes us just and endowed with which we are renewed in the spirit of our mind, and are not merely considered to be just but we are truly named and are just....¹⁷

Protestant Reformers were also keen to define justification's formal cause.¹⁸ In his *Locus on Justification*, Peter Martyr Vermigli expresses general agreement with the overall causal framework of Trent in terms of the "final" cause (the glory of God), the "efficient" cause (divine mercy), and the "meritorious" cause (the death and resurrection of Christ).¹⁹ Vermigli then explains that the point of contention is particularly the "formal cause."²⁰ Unlike Trent, which defines this cause in terms of the righteousness with which one is counted *and made* just, Peter Martyr, with Reformed Protestantism, limits the strict sense of justification to the forensic reckoning of righteousness.²¹ He thus concludes: "Therefore, we say that justification cannot consist in that righteousness and renewal by which we are created anew by God. For it is imperfect because of our corruption, so that we are not able to stand before the judgment of Christ."²² Peter Toon helpfully summarizes how fundamental is this difference among Catholics and Protestants:

On the *formal cause* of justification, that by which God actually pronounces and accepts a sinner as righteous, there had never been agreement. The traditional Roman Catholic position was that at baptism God infuses into the soul his divine

¹⁷ Tanner, *Decrees*, 673. The causal scheme of Trent, which develops the final, efficient, meritorious, instrumental, and formal causes, varies somewhat from the Aristotelian taxonomy.

¹⁸ Richard Muller, *Dictionary of Latin and Greek Theological Terms*, (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1985), 61. For an explanation of how John Calvin's causal scheme relates to Trent, see Lane, *Justification by Faith*, 68-72.

¹⁹ In this section, Vermigli does not mention Trent's "instrumental cause," namely, the sacrament of baptism. This would have been another point of sharp disagreement since Martyr is concerned to uphold faith as the sole means of appropriating the divine forgiveness. Pietro Martire Vermigli, *In epistolam S. Pauli apostoli ad Romanos commentarii*. . . . (Basel: Petrum Perna, 1560), 1252. For the English translation, see Peter Martyr Vermigli, *Predestination and Justification: Two Theological Loci*, trans. and ed. Frank A. James, III, *The Peter Martyr Library* 8 (Kirkville, MO: Truman State University Press, 2003), 159. Hereafter, Vermigli's *Justification Locus* will be listed as *Romanos*, followed in brackets by pages from Frank James's English translation.

²⁰ Ibid.

²¹ Outside of his response to Trent's causal framework in which he identifies justification's formal cause as the imputation of Christ's righteousness (1251-1252 [159]), Peter Martyr does not explicitly address the *causa forma*.

²² Vermigli, *Romanos*, 1251-1252 [159].

grace and that this grace purifies the soul. On seeing this infused righteousness in a human being God accepts him or justifies him. This new grace of the soul is thus the *formal cause* of justification and is at the same time the means of sanctification. With this view Protestant scholars had no sympathy. They argued that once God's grace enters the soul it becomes a human righteousness and no human righteousness is sufficient in quality to be the basis for justification and full acceptance with the eternal God. So they pointed to the external righteousness of Christ the Mediator and argued that his righteousness was imputed or reckoned to the Christian as the *formal cause* of acceptance of justification. Within both of these camps, the Roman and the Protestant, there was a limited variety of teaching within the fixed limits of either the infused, inherent righteousness or the external righteousness of Christ, as the *formal cause*.²³

The following research agrees with Toon that the formal cause is the basic line of demarcation between the Roman Catholic and Reformed Protestant doctrines of justification. This difference is fundamental and seemingly irreconcilable. However, short of the formal cause, there is in fact a significant amount of agreement to which both traditions may lay claim.

To evaluate agreements and differences between the Roman Catholic and Reformed Protestant traditions on the doctrine of justification, the following thesis will consider two figures in whose writings the position is featured prominently: the Protestant Peter Martyr Vermigli (1499-1562) and the Catholic John Henry Newman (1801-1890). Despite a marked increase of Vermigli scholarship during recent decades and the massive amount of research of all things Newman, relatively little consideration has been given to the doctrine of justification in these figures.²⁴ The following study seeks to fill this lacuna.

²³ Toon, *Evangelical Theology*, 145-146.

²⁴ The only monograph dedicated exclusively to Newman's doctrine of justification is Thomas L. Sheridan's volume from 1967, *Newman on Justification: A Theological Biography* (New York: Alba House, 1967). Even so, Sheridan limits his study to the historical development of Newman's position without analyzing the position itself. The only work devoted exclusively to Vermigli's doctrine of justification is Frank A. James' unpublished doctoral dissertation, "*De Iustificazione: The Evolution of Peter Martyr Vermigli's Doctrine of Justification*" (PhD diss., Westminster Theological Seminary, 2000). In this work, James analyses Vermigli's three primary writings on the subject—*loci* on justification from his commentaries on *Genesis* (1542-47), *1 Corinthians* (1548-49), and *Romans* (1550-52), to show how Martyr's doctrine underwent a maturation process during his Protestant career.

There are numerous reasons why Vermigli and Newman are suited for comparison. In addition to experiencing the other's communion before converting,²⁵ their particular influences on Anglicanism,²⁶ and their activity at the intersection of Roman Catholic and Protestant thought,²⁷ they both wrote significant volumes on justification featuring forensic justification and the internal work of the Holy Spirit resulting in good works.²⁸ Two chapters of this thesis are dedicated to examining their positions (chs. two and four), followed by a concluding chapter which explores common concerns, common commitments, different commitments and different conclusions (ch. five).

²⁵ Peter Martyr entered the Augustinian order of Fiesole at age fifteen (in 1514) and remained a faithful son of the Church until his exile at age 43 (1542). Newman's religious experience also turned a corner at age fifteen when he was converted to Evangelicalism in the Church of England. After several fascinating developments (which we will trace in chapter three) Newman's religious commitments led him into full communion with the Roman Catholic Church at age 44 (1845).

²⁶ Philip McNair identifies several ways in which Vermigli assisted Thomas Cranmer in laying groundwork for the Church of England including his participation in the Vestiarian Controversy, contributions to the Second Book of Common Prayer (published in 1552) and The Ecclesiastical Laws (also in 1552), input into The Forty Two Articles of Religion of 1553, and the Reformation Settlement after 1558. "Peter Martyr in England." In *Peter Martyr Vermigli and Italian Reform*, edited by Joseph C. McLelland, (Waterloo, ON: Wilfred Laurier University Press, 1980), 87. Diarmaid MacCulloch also highlights many of these contributions in his chapter "Peter Martyr and Thomas Cranmer," in *Peter Martyr Vermigli: Humanism, Republicanism, Reformation*, ed. Emidio Campi, Frank A. James, III, and Peter Opitz (Geneva: Librairie Droz, 2002), 173-199. Newman's influence upon Anglicanism can hardly be quantified it is so significant. From July 9, 1833, when Newman returned to Oxford from his Mediterranean journey in time for Keble's assize sermon (which Newman considered to be the beginning of the Tractarian Movement) until 1841 when he composed his famous *Tract 90*, Newman's leadership led Anglicanism at large to reflect more deeply upon the meaning of its *via media*. For Newman's account of this history, see his *Apologia pro vita sua: being a history of his religious opinions* (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1882). 36-237. Hereafter abbreviated as *Apo*.

²⁷ For instance, the chief volumes that we consider in this thesis—Vermigli's *Locus on Justification* from his *Romans* commentary and Newman's *Lectures on the Doctrine of Justification*—explicitly level their arguments across the Catholic/Protestant divide.

²⁸ Peter Martyr's three principle works on justification are *loci* from his commentaries on *Genesis*, *1 Corinthians*, and *Romans*, respectively (listed according to their first editions): *In primum librum Mosis, qui vulgo Genesis dicitur, commentarii*. . . . (Zurich: Christophorus Froschouerus, 1569). *In Selectissimam D. Pauli Apostoli . . . Ad Corinthios Epistolam Commentarii*. (Zurich: Christophorus Froschouerus, 1551). Pietro Martire Vermigli, *In epistolam S. Pauli apostoli ad Romanos commentarii*. . . . (Basel: Petrum Perna, 1558). John Henry Newman's chief work is his *Lectures on the Doctrine of Justification*, 3rd ed. (London: Rivingtons, 1874), hereafter *Jfc*. The original version was published in 1838. In the advertisement of the final edition of his *Lectures*, Newman wrote (as a Catholic): "Unless the Author held in substance in 1874 what he published in 1838, he would not at this time be reprinting what he wrote as an Anglican. . . (9). The text of this latter edition is the same as the previous notwithstanding the advertisement of six pages and a total of sixteen qualifying notes indicated by brackets: pp. 31, 73, 96, 101, 154, 186, 187, 190, 198, 201, 226, 236, 260, 343, 348-349, and 353.

Because Vermigli and Newman were separated by three centuries, two chapters also examine the historical contexts in which they operated (chs. one and three). Such analysis reveals numerous similarities between their personal and theological development. We observe, for instance, that their years of study and ministry formation occurred in monastic settings.²⁹ We note how they both experienced religious conversions during periods of personal illness.³⁰ We see them reacting with enthusiasm and spirited polemics to the traditions of their youth.³¹ The work of both men developed within dynamic religious movements (i.e., Italian *Evangelisme*, Reformed Protestantism, the Oxford Movement and nineteenth century Roman Catholicism), that is, collaborative efforts which involved clergy, laity, women, literati, and secular rulers. Most significant of all, however, is Vermigli's and Newman's common reliance upon *duplex iustitia* (twofold righteousness) in their reflection upon justification.

This is an appropriate point to say a word about the particular texts on which we will rely and how we will cite them. The first edition of Peter Martyr's *Romans Locus on Justification* was published in 1558. All references to Vermigli's *Romans* commentary will cite page numbers from his 1560 Latin version (which is available on the *Digital Library of Classic Protestant Texts*) followed in brackets by pages from Frank James's English translation: Peter Martyr Vermigli, *Predestination and Justification: Two Theological Loci*.

²⁹ For Vermigli this started at age fifteen when he entered the monastery at Fiesole. Newman entered Ealing School at the same age and would remain in a community of men for pretty much the remainder of his life.

³⁰ Josiah Simler (Vermigli's biographer) notes that it was during his three years in Naples when Martyr "fell into a serious and deadly sickness." This disease is thought to have been Malaria. *Life, Letters, and Sermons*. Translated and Edited by John Patrick Donnelly. *The Peter Martyr Library* 5. (Kirksville, MO: Thomas Jefferson University Press, 1999), 22. Newman had three such incidents. The first occurred in 1816. About this illness, Newman writes, "The first keen, terrible one, when I was a boy of 15, and it made me a Christian—with experiences before and after, awful and known only to God." *AW*. Edited by Henry Tristram. (London Sheed and Ward, 1956), 150. The second occurred in 1828 in connection with the death of his favorite sister, Mary, and a nervous breakdown from overworking himself. His third bout with illness happened in 1833 in southern Italy where he contracted gastric or typhoid fever. It was on the mend from this malady that Newman wrote his famous poem, *Lead Kindly Light*, en route to England to initiate the Tractarian Movement.

³¹ For example, Newman writes about Evangelicalism: "Away then with this modern, this private, this arbitrary, this unscriptural system, which promising liberty conspires against it; which abolishes Christian Sacraments to introduce barren and dead ordinances...." *Jfc*, 57 [61]. On the other hand, Vermigli follows his assessment of Trent with the rhetorical question, "What else would Pelagius say if he were now alive?" *Romanos*, 1248-49 [156].

With regard to John Henry Newman's *Lectures on the Doctrine of Justification*, we will concentrate on his Third Edition. Since this edition of Newman's *Lectures*, published when he was a Catholic in 1874, is his final and most definitive version, it will be featured first in the footnoted citations. To the right of these citations are page numbers in brackets where the same reference appears in his First Edition, which Newman had published as an Anglican in 1838. Newman's Second Edition was published just two years after the First, in 1840. Because the Second Edition simply consists of formatting changes, it is unimportant for our purposes. Its insignificance for the substance of Newman's message is evident in the fact that his final edition (1874) includes Advertisements from the First and Third Editions, but excludes any mention of the Second.

With the five hundred year anniversary of Luther's Ninety-Five Theses just three years away, there is likely to be significant discussion surrounding the doctrine of justification among Roman Catholics and Protestants. In the interest of enriching this conversation, the following study hopes to clarify where soteriological lines of continuity and difference fall so that each side can make full use of the theological options at their disposal, while also safeguarding the genuine differences that are basic to each tradition. Toward this end, the following study will pursue three objectives.

First, we will seek to understand the motivating factors that influenced Vermigli's and Newman's development of thought on the subject of justification. Such insight is useful to ecumenical dialogue by offering greater understanding of the various theological commitments and concerns which drive the other tradition's teaching. It also has the potential of illuminating how the doctrine of justification may lead one to shift his allegiance across the Catholic/Protestant intersection in a religious conversion.

Second, in the course of examining how the positions of Newman and Vermigli developed, we will address issues that are currently topics of debate in Vermigli and Newman scholarship. For example, against Frank James, we argue that that the *duplex iustitia* continued to be the essence of Vermigli's doctrine into his mature period. We also propose a way to answer the thorny question of whether the Catholic Newman maintained *increated gratia* (uncreated grace) as the formal cause of justification.

Third, we wish to identify theological language for discussing justification at the Catholic/Protestant intersection which recognizes our common concerns, common

commitments, different commitments and different conclusions. Such perspective will help each tradition to approach discussion of the subject with a clearer understanding of where the lines of commonality and difference fall and thus more effectively differentiate negotiable from nonnegotiable elements of the doctrine.

Chapter One

Background to Peter Martyr's Doctrine of Justification

A. The Study of Peter Martyr Vermigli³²

Vermigli's first biography originated as his eulogy. Josiah Simler (1530-1576), a disciple, colleague, and confidant of Vermigli, expanded his mentor's funeral oration, which he had written and delivered on November 12, 1562, to produce the earliest and most definitive biography of Peter Martyr's life.³³ A striking feature of Simler's *Oratio* is its tone. Affection for his mentor breathes from its pages and endows the narrative with sobriety and gravitas.

While sometimes described as "hagiography,"³⁴ Simler's *Oratio* is generally recognized as a carefully constructed historical record.³⁵ As such, it has been commonly employed as the starting point for subsequent biographies.³⁶ Part of its hagiographic feel is due to the original

³² The Italian name, *Pietro Martire Vermigli*, was generally known as "Peter Martyr" outside of Italy (and equivalents in French and German), or simply "Martyr." It is not surprising that modern scholars vary between these options and his last name, "Vermigli." This study will use each of these appellations indiscriminately for the sake of variety.

³³ Josias Simler, *Oratio de vita et obitu clarissimi viri et præstantissimi theologi D. Petri Martyris Vermiglii divinarum literarum professoris in schola Tigurina* (Zurich: Apud Christophorum Froschouerum iuniorem, 1563). Simler's *Oratio* was subsequently attached to the preface of Vermigli's Commentary on *Genesis* (1569) and also appeared in his *Loci communes* from 1582 onward. A sixteenth-century English version of the *Loci communes* included the first English translation of the *Oratio*. *The common places of the most famous and renowned diuine Doctor Peter Martyr: diuided into foure principall parts: with a large addition of manie theologicall and necessarie discourses, some neuer extant before*, trans. Anthonie Marten (London: Henry Denham and Henry Middleton, 1583). A contemporary, annotated translation of Simler's *Oratio* from the 1583 *Loci communes* is available in *Life, Letters, and Sermons*, trans. and ed. John Patrick Donnelly, *The Peter Martyr Library* 5 (Kirksville, MO: Thomas Jefferson University Press, 1999), 9-62.

³⁴ Michael Baumann, "Josias Simler's Hagiography," in *A Companion to Peter Martyr Vermigli*, ed. W. J. Torrance Kirby, Emidio Campi, and Frank A. James, III (Leiden: Brill, 2009), 459.

³⁵ Despite assigning the wrong year to Vermigli's birth, Simler's work has been embraced by scholars as a reliable account of Vermigli's life. Philip McNair, *Peter Martyr in Italy: An Anatomy of Apostasy* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1967), xiv-xvii, 130, hereafter *PMI*; Vermigli, *Life, Letters, and Sermons*, 2.

³⁶ Most notably, Theodore Beza, *Icones, id est Verae imagines virorum doctrina simul et pietate illustrium* (Geneva: C. Froschauer, 1580). For an English translation, see Theodore Beza, *Beza's "Icones": Contemporary Portraits of Reformers of Religion and Letters*, trans. Charles Greig McCrie (London: The Religious Tract Society, 1909), 123-126. Other major works indebted to Simler include Friedrich Christoph Schlosser, *Leben des Theodor de Beza und des Peter Martyr Vermigli: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Zeiten der Kirchen-Reformation* (Heidelberg: Mohr und Zimmer, 1809); Charles Schmidt, *Peter Martyr Vermigli: Leben und ausgewählte Schriften nach handschriftlichen und gleichzeitigen Quellen* (Elberfeld: R.L. Friderichs, 1858). *Life, Letters, and Sermons*, 9-62.

purpose for which Simler wrote it. Faced with a young, fledgling Reformed movement in Zurich, which he describes as plagued with the “despoiling of churches..., sacking of cities, the terrible battles, the imprisonment and slaughter of good men...,”³⁷ Simler applied the conviction and fidelity of Peter Martyr’s legacy to the manifold challenges facing his Reformed brethren in Zurich. According to Michael Baumann, Simler’s *Oratio* had the intention of “not only preserving the remembrance of Peter Martyr, but at the same time posthumously incorporating him into the process of legitimizing the young Reformed church.”³⁸ Inspiration, as much as instruction, was his goal.³⁹

Simler was well suited to compose the *Oratio*. His relationship to Vermigli as a colleague at the academy in Zurich and then succeeding Martyr in that post, afforded him insight into the Reformer’s personal and professional life. He also had access to Vermigli’s letters and commentaries, which he eventually helped to publish.⁴⁰ The closeness of Simler’s association and accuracy of his accounting is affirmed by his sixteenth century contemporaries. John Jewel, for instance, protégé of Vermigli at Oxford and Strasbourg (where Jewel lived in Martyr’s house before taking the Bishopric of Salisbury) said of Simler’s work, “For I seemed to myself to behold the same old man with whom I had formerly lived upon such affectionate terms; and to behold him too, I know not why, more nearly and thoroughly, than when we were living together.”⁴¹ Likewise, modern historians support the reliability of Simler’s account. Philip McNair marshals evidence to this effect on the basis of monastic records which he discovered in Ravenna in 1956.⁴² John Patrick Donnelly, editor of Peter

³⁷ Simler, *Life, Letters, and Sermons*, 10.

³⁸ “Baumann, “Josias Simler’s Hagiography,” 459-465. For this reason, Fritz Büsler calls Simler a “pioneer in biography” (“*wo er eigentliche Pionierarbeit leistete*”) in Fritz Büsler, “Vermigli in Zurich,” in *Peter Martyr Vermigli: Humanism, Republicanism, Reformation*, ed. Emidio Campi, Frank A. James, III, and Peter Opitz (Geneva: Librairie Droz, 2002), 204.

³⁹ By the mid sixteenth century Protestant Martyrologies were written. These were inspiring stories of faith, often against the backdrop of Catholicism. The most popular and enduring example was John Foxe’s *Actes and Monuments*, written in 1563. See Brad S. Gregory, *Salvation at Stake: Christian Martyrdom in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1999).

⁴⁰ Simler, *Life, Letters, and Sermons*, 10n2.

⁴¹ *The Works of John Jewel, Bishop of Salisbury*, ed. John Ayre, vol. 4 (Cambridge, UK: The University Press, 1845; repr., New York: Johnson Reprints, 1968), 126.

⁴² In McNair, *PMI*, xxi-xxii. Philip McNair explains his discovery in April of 1956 of a previously untapped series of monastic records, the Biblioteca Classense in Ravenna, which included the *Acta Capitularia Canonorum Regularium Congregationis Lateransis*, a record of the yearly proceedings of the order. Analyzing these against the backdrop of Simler’s *Oratio*, McNair concludes: “For the

Martyr's *Life, Letters and Sermons* (which features a modern translation of the *Oratio*), also agrees with this assessment, pointing to the "excellence" of Simler's work.⁴³

Other accounts of Vermigli's life appeared between the years 1562 and 1809, particularly in the writings of John Sleidan,⁴⁴ Jon Strype,⁴⁵ and Anthony Wood.⁴⁶ The nineteenth century produced a modest number of studies.⁴⁷ Charles Schmidt's *Leben und ausgewählte Schriften nach handschriftlichen und gleichzeitigen Quellen* is considered to have been the "fundamental and most solid authority for the life of Peter Martyr in exile"

most part they (the *Acta Capitularia*) confirm the statements of the *Oratio*, but they add a wealth of detail which would have taken a lifetime to assemble from subsidiary sources." Ibid., xxii.

⁴³ *Life, Letters, and Sermons*, 2.

⁴⁴ John Sleidan, *The general history of the Reformation of the Church, from the errors and corruptions of the Church of Rome: Begun in Germany by Martin Luther, with the progress thereof in all parts of Christendom, from the year 1517, to the year 1556*, trans. Edmund Bohun (London: Edward Jones, Abel Swall, and Henry Bonwicke, 1689), 443, 483-484, 590, 637.

⁴⁵ John Strype, *Annals of the Reformation and establishment of religion: And other various occurrences in the Church of England during Queen Elizabeth's happy reign, together with an appendix of original papers of state, records, and letters*, vol. 1 pt. 1 (London: John Wyat, 1709; repr., New York: Burt Franklin, 1966), 428-432.

⁴⁶ Anthony à Wood, *Athenae Oxonienses: An exact history of all the writers and bishops who have had their education in the University of Oxford: to which are added the Fasti, or Annals of the said University*, 2 ed., vol. 1 (London: F. C. and J. Rivington et al.), 326-332.

⁴⁷ The first monograph of the nineteenth century to focus on Vermigli came from Schlosser, *Leben des Theodor de Beza*. Nearly a half century later this was followed by George Cornelius Gorham, *Gleanings of a Few Scattered Ears, During the Period of the Reformation in England and of the Times Succeeding A.D. 1533 to A.D. 1589* (London: Bell and Daldy, 1857) who, as his title suggests, addresses elements of Vermigli's legacy and thought. The most rigorous and comprehensive work was by Schmidt, *Peter Martyr Vermigli: Leben und ausgewählte Schriften nach handschriftlichen und gleichzeitigen Quellen* (Elberfeld: R.L. Friderichs, 1858). Schmidt's inclusion of Swiss and German Reformation sources, in addition to Simler's *Oratio*, raised the bar for Vermigli studies. Marianne Young, *The Life and Times of Aonio Paleario, or A history of the Italian Reformers in the Sixteenth Century* (London: Bell and Daldy, 1860) published two years after Schmidt's, provides a chapter on Peter Martyr. The forty pages of Elie Durand, *Vie de Pierre Martyr Vermigli* (Toulouse: Imprimerie A. Chauvin et Fils, 1868) outline the major movements of Vermigli's life. Durand describes Vermigli in the opening words of chapter one as "this miraculous Italian" (*ce Miraculum Italiane*) who followed a previous Reformer from Tuscany, namely Savonarola (*comme l'appelle Calvin, et selon l'expression de Theodore de Beza ce phenix ne des cendres de Savanarole*). This was not the first time the two men had been compared, (cf. "Petrus Martyrem... Florentinae natus et a Savonarolae veluti cineribus prodeuntem phoenicem..." in Beza, *Icones*, 2.). Finally, there is the article at the end of the century by Nikolaus Paulus, "Die Stellung der protestantischen Professoren Zanchi und Vermigli zur Gewissensfreiheit," *Katholik* 71 (1891): 201-228. or *Strassburger Theologischen Studien* 2 (1895): 83-102.

written in the Nineteenth Century.⁴⁸ Schmidt relied considerably upon Simler's *Oratio*, while also giving attention to German and Swiss Reformation sources. These documents, alongside of writings by Celio Curione⁴⁹ and Girolamo Zanchi,⁵⁰ helped to develop the portrait of Vermigli. McNair describes Schmidt's work in the *Leben* as "Sober, painstaking, usually well documented, thorough with Teutonic Gründlichkeit..." and a "balanced work of scholarship, despite its 'confessional tone.'" But the need for research continued.⁵¹

Entering the twentieth century, Vermigli remained in the shadows of obscurity apart from a few brief articles.⁵² A dawning light addressed the shadow in Mariano Di Gangi's Bachelor of Divinity thesis at Presbyterian College, Montreal in 1949 titled "Pietro Martire Vermigli (1500-1562): An Italian Calvinist."⁵³ Eight years later, in 1957, Joseph C. McLelland published *The Visible Words of God: An Exposition of the Sacramental Theology of Peter Martyr Vermigli A.D. 1500-1562*, the first full length volume since Charles Schmidt's work in 1858.⁵⁴ In

⁴⁸ McNair, *PMI*, xviii. Schmidt provides the first modern study, brief as it is, of Vermigli's *Romans locus* on justification, Schmidt, *Peter Martyr Vermigli: Leben und ausgewählte Schriften*, 113-117.

⁴⁹ A friend of Peter Martyr's in exile, Celio Curione (1503-1569) translated writings of Juan de Valdés. Despite his apparent anti-trinitarian inclinations, Curione was invited by Heinrich Bullinger in 1542 to fill a principal post of a school in Lausanne.

⁵⁰ Girolamo Zanchi (1516-1590) first met Vermigli in the Italian city of Lucca in 1541. After fleeing Italy's Inquisition in October of 1551, he settled down in Strasbourg (where he married Curione's eldest daughter) to occupy the chair of Divinity in the College of St. Thomas. See the Introduction to Girolamo Zanchi, *De religione christiana fides – Confession of Christian Religion*, ed. Luca Baschera and Christian Moser, vol. 1, Studies in the History of Christian Traditions 135 (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 1-13.

⁵¹ McNair, *PMI*, viii.

⁵² Notwithstanding J. W. Ashton's article, each of the following simply address Vermigli as a piece of the larger Reformation story: Frédéric Gardy, in his "Les Livres de Pierre Martyr Vermigli conservé à la Bibliothèque de Genève," *Anzeiger für Schweizerische Geschichte* 50 (1919): 1-6, mentions the relocation of Vermigli's personal library to the Academy of Geneva. Benjamin F. Paist, Jr. catalogues the contributions of Vermigli at the Colloquy of Poissy in his "Peter Martyr and the Colloquy of Poissy," *Princeton Theological Review* 20, no. 3 (1922): 418-447. Walter Hugelshofer presents a portrait of Vermigli in his "Zum Porträt des Petrus Martyr Vermilius," *Zwingliana* 3 (1930): 127-129. J. W. Ashton examines Vermigli's literary understanding in "Peter Martyr on the Function and Character of Literature," *Philological Quarterly*, no. 18 (1939): 311-314.

⁵³ Mariano Di Gangi, "Pietro Martire Vermigli (1500-1562): An Italian Calvinist" (BD thesis, Presbyterian College, Montreal, Canada, 1949).

⁵⁴ Joseph C. McLelland, *The Visible Words of God: An Exposition of the Sacramental Theology of Peter Martyr Vermigli, A.D. 1500-1562* (Edinburgh: Oliver & Boyd, 1957). It was originally McLelland's Ph.D. thesis at New College University of Edinburgh completed four years earlier under the supervision of T. F. Torrance. On its heels came two articles by Luigi Santini, "Appunti sulla

1967, Philip M. J. McNair published the next monograph dedicated exclusively to Vermigli, *Peter Martyr in Italy: Anatomy of Apostasy*.⁵⁵ In hindsight, this volume served as a veritable beacon, which drew scholars from various quarters to recognize the fertile opportunity in Vermigli study. Several doctoral theses were published in the 1970s.⁵⁶ In 1980 Robert Kingdon produced a selection of Vermigli's political texts,⁵⁷ and in that same year Joseph McLelland published papers from the 1977 conference at McGill University addressing the "Cultural Impact of Italian Reformers."⁵⁸ Beyond these two works, the decade of the 1980s saw little productivity beyond an occasional article and chapter,⁵⁹ but in the 1990s the sunrise of

ecclesiologia di P. M. Vermigli e la edificazione della Chiesa," *Bolletino della società di studi Valdési* 104 (1958): 69-75 and "La Tesi della fuga nella persecuzione nella teologia di P. M. Vermigli," *Bolletino della società di studi Valdési* 108 (1960): 37-49. During this time, the number of scholars doing Vermigli research grew. Gordon Huelin's doctoral thesis was produced in 1954 at the University of London, "Peter Martyr and the English Reformation," and within a decade Marvin W. Anderson had finished his unpublished thesis "Biblical Humanism and Roman Catholic Reform 1444-1563: A Study of Renaissance Philology and New Testament Criticism from Laurentius Valla to Pietro Martyre Vermigli" (PhD diss., University of Aberdeen, 1964).

⁵⁵ McNair, *PMI*. Edoardo Labanchi published an Italian translation four years later titled *Pietro Martire Vermigli in Italia: Un'anatomia di un'apostasia*, trans. Edoardo Labanchi (Naples: Centro biblico, 1971).

⁵⁶ These included: Klaus Sturm, *Die Theologie Peter Martyr Vermiglis während seines ersten Aufenthalts in Strassburg 1542-1547: Ein Reformkatholik unter den Vätern der reformierten Kirche*, Beiträge zur Geschichte und Lehre der Reformierten Kirche (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1971), completed at the University of Bonn under the supervision of Ernst Bizer; John Patrick Donnelly, "Peter Martyr on Fallen Man: A Protestant Scholastic View" (PhD diss., University of Wisconsin, Madison, 1971), completed under the supervision of Robert M. Kingdon, later to be revised and published as *Calvinism and Scholasticism in Vermigli's Doctrine of Man and Grace*, Studies in Medieval and Reformation Thought 18 (Leiden: Brill, 1976). Donnelly's work was substantially complete when Sturm's monograph was published, and, according to Donnelly, didn't exercise any influence upon it (*ibid.*, 5n13.) Marvin W. Anderson produced, *Peter Martyr, a Reformer in Exile (1542-1562): A Chronology of Biblical Writings in England & Europe* (Nieuwkoop: De Graaf, 1975). Salvatore Corda, *Veritas Sacramenti: A Study in Vermigli's Doctrine of the Lord's Supper*, Zürcher Beiträge zur Reformationsgeschichte (Zurich: Theologischer Verlag, 1975), completed at the University of Zürich under the supervision of Drs. Fritz Blanke and Fritz Büsser.

⁵⁷ Robert M. Kingdon, *The Political Thought of Peter Martyr Vermigli: Selected Texts and Commentary*, Travaux d'humanisme et Renaissance 178 (Geneva: Librairie Droz, 1980).

⁵⁸ Joseph C. McLelland, *Peter Martyr Vermigli and Italian Reform* (Waterloo, ON: Wilfred Laurier University Press, 1980).

⁵⁹ Marvin W. Anderson, "Rhetoric and Reality: Peter Martyr and the English Reformation," *Sixteenth Century Journal* 19, no. 3 (1988): 451-469; Lynne Courter Boughton, "Supralapsarianism and the Role of Metaphysics in Sixteenth-century Reformed Theology," *The Westminster Theological Journal*, no. 48 (1986): 63-96; G. Dall'Asta, "Pietro Martire Vermigli (1499-1562). La sua teologia eucaristica," *La scuola cattolica*, no. 91 (1983): 275-303; Richard A. Muller, *Christ and the Decree: Christology and Predestination in Reformed Theology from Calvin to Perkins* (Durham, NC: Labyrinth

Vermigli research made profound gains upon the remaining shadows of obscurity. Mariano Di Gangi developed his previous work into a popular level biography of Vermigli in 1993.⁶⁰ Then there was the biggest development of all, the step that moved the “Renaissance”⁶¹ of Vermigli research into plain sight: the inauguration of *The Peter Martyr Library* in October of 1994.⁶² The *Library* is an extensive work of English translation, annotation, and commentary by an international range of scholars. Since the 1990’s, three particular scholars have championed the project: John Patrick Donnelly,⁶³ Joseph C. McLelland,⁶⁴ and Frank A. James III.⁶⁵

Press, 1986); M. A. Overell, "Peter Martyr in England 1547-1553: An Alternative View," *Sixteenth Century Journal* 15, no. 1 (1984): 87-104.

⁶⁰ Mariano Di Gangi, *Peter Martyr Vermigli, 1499-1562: Renaissance Man, Reformation Master* (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1993).

⁶¹ Jason Zuidema uses the word “Renaissance” in his *Peter Martyr Vermigli (1499-1562) and the Outward Instruments of Divine Grace* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2008), 17. Zuidema’s section titled “The Vermigli Research Renaissance” offers a cogent summary of this development.

⁶² *The Peter Martyr Library* is a collaborative effort on the part of Truman State University Press, Thomas Jefferson University Press and Sixteenth Century Journal. Nine volumes have appeared so far: Peter Martyr Vermigli, *Early Writings: Creed, Scripture, Church*, trans. and ed. Mariano Di Gangi and Joseph C. McLelland, *The Peter Martyr Library 1* (Kirksville, MO: Thomas Jefferson University Press, 1994); Peter Martyr Vermigli, *Dialogue on the Two Natures in Christ*, trans. and ed. John Patrick Donnelly, *The Peter Martyr Library 2* (Kirksville, MO: Thomas Jefferson University Press, 1995); Peter Martyr Vermigli, *Philosophical Works: On the Relation of Philosophy to Theology*, trans. and ed. Joseph C. McLelland, *The Peter Martyr Library 4* (Kirksville, MO: Truman State University Press, 1996); Peter Martyr Vermigli, *Sacred Prayers Drawn from the Psalms of David*, trans. and ed. John Patrick Donnelly, *The Peter Martyr Library 3* (Kirksville, MO: Thomas Jefferson University Press, 1996); *Life, Letters, and Sermons*; Peter Martyr Vermigli, *The Oxford Treatise and Disputation on the Eucharist, 1549*, trans. and ed. Joseph C. McLelland, *The Peter Martyr Library 7* (Kirksville, MO: Truman State University Press, 2000); Peter Martyr Vermigli, *Commentary on Lamentations of the Prophet Jeremiah*, trans. and ed. Daniel John Shute, *The Peter Martyr Library 6* (Kirksville, MO: Truman State University Press, 2002); Peter Martyr Vermigli, *Predestination and Justification: Two Theological Loci*, trans. and ed. Frank A. James, III, *The Peter Martyr Library 8* (Kirksville, MO: Truman State University Press, 2003); Peter Martyr Vermigli, *Commentary on Aristotle’s Nicomachean Ethics*, trans. and ed. Emidio Campi and Joseph C. McLelland, *The Peter Martyr Library 9* (Kirksville, MO: Truman State University Press, 2006).

⁶³ Donnelly, *Calvinism and Scholasticism*; John Patrick Donnelly, "Peter Martyr Vermigli’s Political Ethics," in *Peter Martyr Vermigli: Humanism, Republicanism, Reformation*, ed. Emidio Campi, Frank A. James, III, and Peter Opitz (Geneva: Librairie Droz, 2002), 59-66. Donnelly also edited and translated three volumes in *The Peter Martyr Library: Dialogue on the Two Natures in Christ; Sacred Prayers; Life, Letters, and Sermons*.

⁶⁴ Joseph C. McLelland is the editor and translator of three volumes of *The Peter Martyr Library: Early Writings; Philosophical Works; Commentary on Aristotle’s Nicomachean Ethics*. He also served as co-editor with John Patrick Donnelly and Frank A. James III of *The Peter Martyr Reader*, ed. (Kirksville, MO: Truman State University Press, 1999), hereafter *PMR*.

B. The “Quite Learned Man” from Italy

On October 28, 1542, Martin Bucer wrote a letter to John Calvin announcing: “A man has arrived from Italy who is quite learned in Latin, Greek, and Hebrew and well skilled in the Scriptures..., his name is Peter Martyr.”⁶⁵ From the perspective of those who were north of the Alps, it may have appeared that Peter Martyr emerged *ex nihilo*. And before McNair’s groundbreaking research, *Peter Martyr in Italy*, modern interpreters may have thought the same. The following sketch explores from whence Vermigli came, starting with his years in Italy (1499-1542). Such background will illumine contributing factors to his doctrine of justification.

⁶⁵ Frank A. James, III, *Peter Martyr Vermigli and Predestination: The Augustinian Inheritance of an Italian Reformer* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998), based on his doctoral thesis titled: *Praedestinatio Dei: The Intellectual Origins of Peter Martyr Vermigli’s Doctrine of Double Predestination*, completed under the supervision of Alister E. McGrath, at St. Peter’s College, Oxford University, 1993; “A Late Medieval Parallel in Reformation Thought: Gemina Praedestinatio in Gregory of Rimini and Peter Martyr Vermigli,” in *Via Augustini: Augustine in the Later Middle Ages, Renaissance, and Reformation; Essays in Honor of Damasus Trapp*, ed. Frank A. James, III and Heiko A. Oberman (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1991), 157-188; “Juan de Valdés Before and After Peter Martyr Vermigli: The Reception of Gemina Praedestinatio in Valdés Later Thought,” *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte* 83 (1992): 180-208; “Peter Martyr Vermigli,” in *Historical Handbook of Major Biblical Interpreters*, ed. Donald K. McKim (Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1998), 239-245; “Neglected Sources of the Reformed Doctrine of Predestination: Ulrich Zwingli and Peter Martyr Vermigli,” *Modern Reformation* 7 (1998): 18-22; “Peter Martyr Vermigli: At the Crossroads of Late Medieval Scholasticism, Christian Humanism, and Resurgent Augustinianism,” in *Protestant Scholasticism: Essays in Reassessment*, ed. Carl R. Trueman and R. Scott Clark (Carlisle: Paternoster Press, 1999), 62-78; “*De Iustificatione*: The Evolution of Peter Martyr Vermigli’s Doctrine of Justification” (PhD diss., Westminster Theological Seminary, 2000); “The Complex of Justification: Peter Martyr Vermigli Versus Albert Pighius,” in *Peter Martyr Vermigli: Humanism, Republicanism, Reformation*, ed. Emidio Campi, Frank A. James, III, and Peter Opitz (Geneva: Librairie Droz, 2002), 45-58; “Peter Martyr Vermigli: Probing his Puritan Influence,” in *The Practical Calvinist: An Introduction to the Presbyterian & Reformed Heritage; In honor of Dr. D. Clair Davis*, ed. Peter A. Lillback and D. Clair Davis (Fearn, UK: Christian Focus, 2002), 149-160; “Peter Martyr in Bucer’s Strassburg: The Early Formulations of His Doctrine of Justification,” *Perichoresis* 1, no. 2 (2003): 5-33; “*Nunc Peregrinus Oberrat*: Peter Martyr in Context,” in *Peter Martyr Vermigli and the European Reformations: Semper Reformanda*, ed. Frank A. James, III (Leiden: Brill, 2004), xiii-xxv; “The Bullinger/Vermigli Axis: Collaborators in Toleration and Reformation,” in *Heinrich Bullinger: Life – Thought – Influence: Zurich, Aug. 25-29, 2004; International Congress Heinrich Bullinger (1504-1575)*, ed. Emidio Campi and Peter Opitz, vol. 1 (Zurich: Theologischer Verlag Zürich, 2007), 165-176; He is coeditor with J. Patrick Donnelly and Joseph C. McLelland, *PMR: Vermigli, Predestination and Justification*.

⁶⁶ “*Advenit ex Italia vir quidam graece, hebraice et latine admodum doctus, et in scripturis feliciter versatus..., Petro Martyri nomen est.*” Martin Bucer to John Calvin, 28 October 1542. Jean Calvin, *Ioannis Calvini opera quae supersunt omnia*, ed. Guilielmus Baum, Eduardus Cunitz, and Eduardus Reuss, vol. 11, *Corpus Reformatorum* 39 (Brunsviga: C.A. Schwetschke, 1873), sec. 430.

In the year 1514, at age fifteen, Peter Martyr entered the Augustinian order in the town of Fiesole, nearly eight kilometers from his native Florence.⁶⁷ After three years at the monastery, during which Martyr distinguished himself as a diligent student, he was judged worthy to begin studies under the Order's most outstanding teachers. For this he was sent north to Padua to the monastery of *San Giovanni di Verdara*.⁶⁸

Founded in 1222, the University of Padua reached its apex of brilliance and prestige in the first decade of the Sixteenth Century. It was at Padua where Peter Martyr encountered a serious-minded pursuit of doctrinal reform⁶⁹ and a rich tradition of Aristotle.⁷⁰ Without getting buried in hairsplitting partisanship, which occasionally erupted between Aristotelian schools,⁷¹ Vermigli imbibed the Philosopher's logic and method from his professors, most of whom were Dominicans and Thomists.

Exceptionally focused, Vermigli supplemented his formal training in philosophy with a rigorous course of private study, a routine that was aided by the exquisite library of his monastery.⁷² After finding numerous errors in the Latin translations of Aristotle, he proceeded to study Greek by night in order to go *ad fontes*. The acquisition of this language opened the door for Martyr to engage Renaissance humanism with greater depth and immediacy. Under the tutelage of Professor Pietro Bembo, arguably the most distinguished humanist scholar to be associated with *San Giovanni di Verdara*, Vermigli acquired an insatiable appetite for the study of classical sources.⁷³ After eight years in Padua, Martyr underwent priestly ordination

⁶⁷ According to Simler's *Oratio*, Martyr's Mother had taught him Latin when he was a child. *Life, Letters, and Sermons*, 11.

⁶⁸ Paolo Sambin, "La formazione quattrocentesca della biblioteca di S. Giovanni di Verdara in Padova," *Atti dell'Istituto Veneto di Scienze Lettere ed Arti, Classe di scienze morali e lettere* 114 (1956): 263-280.

⁶⁹ Frederic Corss Church, *The Italian Reformers, 1534-1564* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1932; repr., 1974), 7.

⁷⁰ For a taxonomy of the various Aristotelian "schools" of the day, see Donnelly, *Calvinism and Scholasticism*, 13-41; McNair, *PMI*, 86-115.

⁷¹ McNair, *PMI*, 86.

⁷² McNair says, "This library was one of the great formative influences on Martyr's early years...." *PMI*, 93.

⁷³ The "ambience of [Padua's] devout and learned humanism" is described by Dermot Fenlon in *Heresy and Obedience in Tridentine Italy: Cardinal Pole and the Counter Reformation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1972), 26.

and he simultaneously received a doctorate in theology (1526).⁷⁴ If, in this period, he had been asked whether he was an Aristotelian or a humanist, Peter Martyr may likely have answered “yes.”⁷⁵

The seven years following Vermigli’s departure from Padua opened new vocational horizons. He was elected to the office of public preacher, an illustrious position in his day. Martyr traveled through northern Italy lecturing on Scripture, philosophy (and Homer) and, whenever possible, he studied these subjects with careful attention.⁷⁶ In just a few years, while serving in Bologna, Vermigli would teach himself the Hebrew language, no small feat in those days. He was assisted by the tutoring of a certain Jewish doctor named Isaac.⁷⁷ So distinguished did Vermigli’s ministry become, that his Augustinian order described him as “*Predicatorem eximium*” (an exceptional preacher).⁷⁸ In the spring of 1530 Peter Martyr served as vicar to the prior at Bologna. McNair suggests that it was here that the activity of preaching and teaching started on a trajectory that would eventually estrange Vermigli’s mind from his scholastic training:

From the Schoolmen he turned to the Fathers, from the Fathers to the Vulgate, and from the Vulgate to the Source itself—the lively Oracles of God in their original expression. At Padua he had learned Greek to read Aristotle: at Bologna he learned Hebrew to read Scripture.⁷⁹

As his name grew famous in the largest Italian cities, Vermigli was promoted to an even higher position. By unanimous consent, he was made abbot of his Order’s monastery in

⁷⁴ Simler, *Oratio in Life, Letters, and Sermons*, 17.

⁷⁵ Frank James provides a helpful survey of how modern scholars orient Vermigli on the historiographical map, particularly with regard to theological methodology. James posits three common profiles: “pioneer of Calvinist Thomism,” “Protestant Humanist” and “intensified Augustinian.” After examining each of these labels, James argues for the intensified Augustinian view. James, “*De Iustificatione*”, 52-92.

⁷⁶ According to Simler, such study would mostly happen in the houses of his Congregation at Padua, Ravenna, Bologna, and Vercelli. *Life, Letters, and Sermons*, 17.

⁷⁷ Simler, *Oratio in Life, Letters, and Sermons*, 17.

⁷⁸ McNair, *PMI*, 192.

⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, 124-125.

Spoletto.⁸⁰ Effectively navigating the landmines of Spoleto's volatile politic, he managed to bring moral order out of chaos. The requisite vision and skill to generate religious reform was displayed as part of his spiritual composition. Probably because of this distinction, Martyr was assigned a new post as Abbot of *San Pietro ad Aram* in Naples.

Simler identifies Naples as the place where Vermigli's theological journey turned a corner. During the three years of Peter Martyr's sojourn at *San Pietro* (1537-1540), "the greater light of God's truth" began to shine upon him.⁸¹ According to Frank James, "there is little doubt that Simler understood this 'greater light of God's truth' to be the doctrine of justification by faith alone."⁸² To appreciate why this is so will require familiarity with the religious sociology of Italy during this period, particularly the movement of "*Evangelisme*."⁸³

C. The Italian Renewal Movement Called "*Evangelisme*"

The variegated shape of sixteenth century Italian religious reform has resisted precise definition.⁸⁴ Eva-Marie Jung calls it "the last Catholic reform movement before the

⁸⁰ Spoleto is roughly 200 kilometer south east of Florence, a little more than half way to Rome.

⁸¹ Simler, *Life, Letters, and Sermons*, 19. Simler also notes that it was during his three years in Naples when Martyr "fell into a serious and deadly sickness," although we have no indication whether this experience factored into his conversion. Ibid., 22. This disease is thought to have been Malaria.

⁸² James, "*De Iustificatione*", 1. James here is echoing the assessment of Philip McNair who states that the dawning light of God's truth was "the doctrine of justification by Faith alone in a crucified yet living Christ. The acceptance of this vital doctrine entailed so drastic a reorientation of heart and mind that it amounted to conversion." McNair, *PMI*, 179.

⁸³ This study will use the term "*Evangelisme*" instead of the more common "Evangelism," to avoid confusion with the name used by current parlance to describe the activity of gospel proclamation. Eva-Maria Jung et al. employ "Evangelism" as a sociological designation following the third volume of Perre Imbart de la Tour's study of the early Reformation in France: *Les Origines de la Réforme: L' Evangelisme*, vol. 3 (Paris: Hachette, 1914).

⁸⁴ Significant works on this topic include: William J. Bouwsma, *Venice and the Defense of Republican Liberty* (Los Angeles: University of California, 1984); Delio Cantimori, *Eretici italiani del Cinquecento: Ricerche storiche*, Biblioteca storica Sansoni (Florence: G.C. Sansoni, 1939); Salvatore Caponetto, *The Protestant Reformation in Sixteenth-century Italy*, trans. Anne Tedeschi and John A. Tedeschi (Kirkville, MO: Thomas Jefferson University Press, 1999); Church, *The Italian Reformers, 1534-1564*; Fenlon, *Heresy and Obedience*; Elisabeth Gleason, "On the Nature of Sixteenth-century Italian Evangelism: Scholarship, 1953-1978," *Sixteenth Century Journal* 9, no. 3 (1978): 3-25; Elisabeth Gleason, *Gasparo Contarini: Venice, Rome, and Reform* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993); Paul F. Grendler, "Religious Restlessness in Sixteenth-century Italy," *The Canadian Catholic Historical Association* 33 (1966): 25-38; Eva-Maria Jung, "On the Nature of Evangelism in Sixteenth-century Italy," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 14 (1953): 511-527; John Martin, "Salvation

Council of Trent and the first ecumenical movement after the schism of the Reformation.”⁸⁵ According to Elisabeth Gleason, the most helpful *terminus a quo* for assessing the movement is 1512; she proposes the *terminus ad quem* should be extended to the 1560’s, allowing for “echoes” into the seventeenth century.⁸⁶ Gleason has written a detailed historiographical survey of the movement and offers a word of caution for interpreters to not lose sight of its vast scope.⁸⁷

Among the first studies in English devoted to the movement was Eva-Marie Jung’s article “On the Nature of Evangelism in Sixteenth-Century Italy.”⁸⁸ Jung famously defined its three characteristics: theologically undogmatic, aristocratic, and transitory.⁸⁹ In a similar vein, William Bouwsma argued for the movement’s subjective impulse by highlighting its affinities with Renaissance republicanism, an attitude that was especially vibrant in the territory of Venice where civil magistrates sought to establish their own jurisdiction apart from the Roman See. These political values are thought to have prepared the Italian soil from which *Evangelisme* eventually emerged.⁹⁰

and Society in Sixteenth-century Venice: Popular Evangelism in a Renaissance City,” *Journal of Modern History* 60 (1988): 205-233; John Martin, *Venice’s Hidden Enemies: Italian Heretics in a Renaissance City*, Studies on the History of Society and Culture 16 (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993); McNair, *Peter Martyr in Italy*; José C. Nieto, *Juan de Valdés and the Origins of the Spanish and Italian Reformation*, Travaux d’humanisme et Renaissance 108 (Geneva: Librairie Droz, 1970); Anne Jacobson Schutte, “Periodization of Sixteenth-century Italian Religious History: The Post-Cantimori Paradigm Shift,” *Journal of Modern History* 61 (1989): 269-284; Paolo Simoncelli, *Evangelismo italiano del cinquecento: Questione religiosa e Nicodemismo politico*, Italia e Europa (Rome: Istituto storico italiano per l’età moderna e contemporanea, 1979).

⁸⁵ Jung, “On the Nature,” 512.

⁸⁶ Gleason, “On the Nature,” 25.

⁸⁷ Ibid., 3-26. Gleason cautions that on account of the dynamic nature of Italian *Evangelisme* interpreters are especially prone to misconception. She explains how evaluations of the movement often depend on the writings of a relatively small number of well known figures or on records from inquisitorial proceedings. Sometimes a narrow sampling of these sources has been the basis of judgment. The tenuous ground of these assessments is a methodological hazard to which scholars must be attentive. Gleason, *Gasparo Contarini*, 190-191. Four years after Gleason, the Italian scholar, Susanna Peyronel Rambaldi, offered a literature survey in “Ancora sull’evangelismo italiano: Categoria o invenzione storiografica?,” *Società e storia* 5, no. 18 (1982): 935-967. John Tedeschi, *The Italian Reformation of the Sixteenth Century and the Diffusion of Renaissance Culture: A Bibliography of the Secondary Literature (ca. 1750-1997)*, (Modena: Panini; Ferrara: ISR, 2000).

⁸⁸ Jung, “On the Nature,” 511-527.

⁸⁹ Ibid., 520.

⁹⁰ Bouwsma, *Venice and the Defense*.

Such portraits have not gone unchallenged. The most ardent critique of Jung's and Bouwsma's historiography has been by Philip McNair, who disagrees with their explanation of the movement's origin and nature. Regarding the former, he rejects the notion that *Evangelisme* was an indigenous, Catholic phenomenon in isolation from the Protestant north.⁹¹ He cites evidence from "monastic records, humanist letters, Valdésian memoirs, and histories of Naples" to demonstrate the influence of Protestant literature which circulated among the friends of Vermigli.⁹² A significant example from his arsenal is a statement from Simler's *Oratio*, which explains the three years in Naples in which Vermigli acquired and studied carefully Bucer's commentaries on the Gospels⁹³ and the annotations on the Psalms.⁹⁴ Martyr also read Zwingli's book *On True and False Religion* and another volume of his *On God's Providence*,⁹⁵ together with some works from Erasmus. According to Simler, "He [Vermigli] often frankly confessed that he made much progress from reading all of these."⁹⁶

Following from this premise, McNair also questions the nature of *Evangelisme*, particularly whether it can be called undogmatic. In making his case, he correlates the

⁹¹ For a counter argument to McNair, see Dermot Fenlon who argues for the indigenous origins of Italian *Evangelisme* in his book *Heresy and Obedience*. Fenlon points to Cardinals such as Pole, Contarini, Giberti, and Morone as examples of men who experienced renewal and worked out their doctrine of justification in the Roman communion of Italy. A credible case is also made by José C. Nieto, who finds the roots of Valdés's thought to emerge from the mysticism of Spanish *alumbrados*. Nieto, *Juan de Valdés and the Origins*, 314-322.

⁹² McNair, *PMI*, 142. McNair also questions the objectivity of historians who maintain this view, scholars such as Imbart de la Tour, Monsignor Jedin, and Dr. Jung. Because they are Catholic, McNair argues that "'Evangelism has been used [by them] as a Roman Catholic device for explaining away an embarrassing phase of Catholic Church history when what looks suspiciously like crypto-Lutheranism invaded the very College of Cardinals'" (ibid., 6). The tools of historicism have also been used against McNair, suggesting that he too may have succumbed to prejudices as evidenced by his reference to the Rome-imposed "Iron Curtain which had descended upon the Alps" (ibid., 1, 293). Anne J. Schutte questions whether these allusions betray a Cold War mentality in McNair's work. Anne Jacobson Schutte, "The *Lettere Volgari* and the Crisis of Evangelism in Italy," *Renaissance Quarterly* 28 (1975): 643.

⁹³ Martin Bucer, *Enarrationes perpetua in sacra quatuor Evangelia* (Strasbourg: Georgium Vlricherum Andlanum, 1530).

⁹⁴ Martin Bucer, *Sacrorum psalmorum libri quinque* (Strasbourg: Georgium Vlricherum Andlanum, 1529). Bucer published this work under his pseudonym Aretio Felini

⁹⁵ *De vera et falsa religione* (Zurich, 1525) and *De providentia Dei* (Zurich, 1530); these are considered to be Zwingli's two most important works.

⁹⁶ Simler, *Life, Letters, and Sermons*, 20.

theological concerns of the Valdésian circle of Naples (of which Peter Martyr was a part) to the contours of the Protestant Reformation. These concerns are evident in books and sermons that circulated through major Italian cities in the 1530's, particularly in Venice, Padua, Florence, Rome, and Naples.⁹⁷ Accordingly, McNair defines *Evangelisme* as a "positive reaction of certain spiritually-minded Catholics to the challenge of Protestantism, and, in particular, to the crucial doctrine of justification by faith."⁹⁸ While generally compelling, McNair's case is weakened by his failure to interact with Contarini's experience of spiritual illumination and embrace of justification by faith alone, as expressed in his letters.⁹⁹

While perspectives on Italian *Evangelisme* are legion,¹⁰⁰ it is nevertheless possible to discern the movement's basic orientation. The perimeters of our thesis will not allow for a comprehensive treatment; but, in what follows, we will sketch out the basic agenda of *Evangelisme*. For starters, we will consider religious discourse in Italy during the years reaching toward and into the sixteenth century.

D. Religious Discourse in Italy: 1490-1530

"Criticism of ecclesiastical institutions and proposals for church reform," writes Elisabeth Gleason, "had been persistent themes of Italian religious thought during the first three decades of the sixteenth century."¹⁰¹ This criticism was due to several factors including an inadequate resolution to the Conciliar Movement in the Fifth Lateran Council (1512-17), an

⁹⁷ McNair, *PMI*, 6-15. See also Grendler, "Religious Restlessness," 26. By the early 1540's, *Evangelisme* "began to develop a significant popular following, especially in the cities and towns of northern Italy." Martin, "Salvation and Society," 208.

⁹⁸ McNair, *PMI*, 8.

⁹⁹ See Hubert Jedin, "Contarini und Camaldoli," *Archivio Italiano per la Storia della Pietà* 2 (1959): 59-118. It was, "on Holy Saturday of 1511," when Contarini "experienced a moment of illumination" that was likened to Luther's epiphany, where "he was fully convinced that salvation could not be won by any human act but was God's free gift...." Bouwsma, *Venice and the Defense*, 124. For a detailed examination of Contarini's experience, see Gleason, *Gasparo Contarini*, 11-18; James Bruce Ross, "Gasparo Contarini and His Friends," *Studies in the Renaissance* 17 (1970): 204-217. Alister E. McGrath agrees that Cardinal Contarini had embraced *sola fide* before Luther, even if he did not articulate it as such, Alister E. McGrath, *ID*, 310-311. See also Massimo Firpo, "The Italian Reformation and Juan de Valdés," trans. John A. Tedeschi, *Sixteenth Century Journal* 27 (1996): 353-364;

¹⁰⁰ John Martin displays the scope of this variety in Martin, "Salvation and Society," 209.

¹⁰¹ Gleason, *Gasparo Contarini*, 192.

abysmal standard of morality by Pope Alexander VI and his Borgia *famiglia* on whom he had lavished abundant privilege and wealth,¹⁰² the Medici papacies which had made the city of Rome into a veritable haven of humanism,¹⁰³ ongoing conflict between the Catholic Emperor, Charles V, and his Pope(s),¹⁰⁴ the popularizing of humanist ideals by public intellectuals such as Erasmus (who visited Italy in the years 1506-09),¹⁰⁵ an effusive dissemination of such ideals by the recently invented printing press,¹⁰⁶ and the distribution of Protestant tracts into Italy that questioned the accuracy of Catholic Church doctrine.¹⁰⁷

On account of the above-mentioned factors, there was widespread recognition of the need for reform.¹⁰⁸ In the opening address at the Fifth Lateran Council in 1512, for example, the Augustinian Cardinal Egidio da Viterbo (1469-1532) declared: "Men must be

¹⁰² In addition making a mockery of Christian piety, most popes of this era lacked the spiritual fortitude to implement genuine renewal. These spiritual malnourished leaders included Pope Sixtus IV (1471-1484), Innocent VIII (1484-1492), Alexander VI (1492-1503), Pius III (1503), Julius II (1503-1513), Leo X (1513-1521) and Clement VII (1523-34). Adrian XI (1522-1523) was a short-lived exception to this pattern. Their inability to instill confidence among the faithful inevitably promoted a movement of dissent.

¹⁰³ Daniel A. Crews, *Twilight of the Renaissance: The Life of Juan de Valdés* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2008), 47.

¹⁰⁴ Peter Burke, *Culture and Society in Renaissance Italy, 1420-1540*, Studies in Cultural History (London: Batsford, 1972), 276. Political and military struggles plagued the peninsula from 1494-1559, in the so called the Great Italian Wars. During Charles V's reign, such conflict was most dramatically displayed in the sack of Rome in 1527. Machiavelli's invocation of a pragmatic prince and Savonarola's bonfire of the vanities were two early examples of how Italians responded to this unrest. The same trajectory of discontent can be traced to the salons of Naples where Vermigli et al. eventually crossed the Rubicon into Reformation theology.

¹⁰⁵ Johan Huizinga, *Erasmus and the Age of Reformation* (New York: Harper and Row, 1957), 62-68; Nieto, *Juan de Valdés and the Origins*, 314-322.

¹⁰⁶ Huizinga writes, "Erasmus belonged to the generation which had grown up together with the youthful art of printing. To the world of those days it was still like a newly acquired organ; people felt rich, powerful, happy in the possession of this 'almost divine implement.'" Huizinga, *Erasmus and the Age of Reformation*, 65. For its impact on Italy see Caponetto, *Protestant Reformation*, 18.

¹⁰⁷ Paul Grendler examines literary aspects of religious restlessness in *Cinquecento Italy*. Grendler, "Religious Restlessness," 25-38.

¹⁰⁸ So Dermot Fenlon opens his book *Heresy and Obedience in Tridentine Italy* with the memorable words, "At the close of the middle ages the condition of the Church was nowhere considered to be healthy... [it was] magnificent in everything except religion." His first chapter provides a helpful telling of this story. Fenlon, *Heresy and Obedience*, 1-23.

changed by religion, not religion by men."¹⁰⁹ This "religious uneasiness," common to the whole of Europe at the start of the sixteenth century, sent thoughtful Christians to reexamine the roots of their faith.¹¹⁰ This examination produced a wide range of initiatives aimed at producing spiritual renewal, the form of which differed depending upon region and time period. It is essential to remember the various geographical, political, and economic realities in each region of the peninsula. The notion of a unified Italian nation was at best a theoretical abstraction in the poetry of Dante and Machiavelli. In truth, Italian states were fragmented and often at war among themselves.¹¹¹ The following overview will highlight some of this phenomenon along with the basic commitments to Italian *Evangelisme* that shaped and guided Peter Martyr's theological outlook, especially his doctrine of justification.

One reason for the complexity of *Evangelisme* is the fact that it developed amidst numerous other movements. As mentioned, its origins are significantly indebted to the humanist project of Erasmus. Works such as his *Inquisitio de fide*¹¹² and *Enchiridion Militis Christiani*¹¹³ produced an intellectual climate that encouraged discovery. The *ad fontes* orientation of Erasmus, which he applied to Christian sources, piqued the interest of his contemporaries, motivating many to take up and read, especially the New Testament letters of Paul.¹¹⁴

¹⁰⁹ Eva-Marie Jung suggests that this classic formula, "*reformandi sunt homines per sacra et non sacra per homines*," could be called the motto of *Evangelisme*. Jung, "On the Nature," 513.

¹¹⁰ Oddone Ortolani, "The Hopes of the Italian Reformers in Roman Action," in *Italian Reformation Studies in Honor of Laelius Socinus*, ed. John A. Tedeschi (Florence: Felice Le Monnier, 1965), 13. Ortolani is best known for his work on the Italian *Evangelisme* martyr, Pietro Carnesecchi (1508-1567). Oddone Ortolani, *Pietro Carnesecchi: Con estratti dagli atti del processo del Santo officio* (Florence: F. Le Monnier, 1963). Anne J. Schutte offers a trenchant analysis of this history in her work, Schutte, "*Lettere Volgari*," 639-688.

¹¹¹ Caponetto, *Protestant Reformation*, xviii. William Bouwsma's examination of Venice is a fine example of how one region differed significantly from another. Bouwsma, *Venice and the Defense*, 124.

¹¹² *Inquisitio de Fide: A Colloquy by Desiderius Erasmus Roterodamus, 1524.*, ed. Craig R. Thompson, 2nd ed. (Hamden, CT: Archon Books, 1975).

¹¹³ Desiderius Erasmus Roterodamus, *Enchiridion militis christiani* (Leiden: Ex Officinâ Ioannis Maire, 1641).

¹¹⁴ About these epistles, Erasmus advised his readers, *In primis autem Paulum tibi facito familiarem: hic tibi semper habendus in sinu, nocturna versandus manu, versandus diurna, postremo & ad verbum ediscendus*. "In the first place, make Paul your intimate friend . . . keep him always in your bosom, turning it night and day . . . and learn (him) by heart." *Ibid.*, 328.

This meant a renewed focus upon the Bible. Such was true, for instance, of The Benedictines of Santa Giustina of Padua, whose attention to Scripture approached the text-centered approach of Protestants.¹¹⁵ Reading the gospels served as an initial step toward studying the Pauline epistles and eventually discussion about the doctrine of “justification, faith, works, papal power, purgatory, and a whole panoply of other matters theological.”¹¹⁶ While little more than embryonic in scope, these developments represented a conscious re-appropriation of sacred resources against the ignorance, corruption, and superstitious practices of the early sixteenth-century clergy.¹¹⁷

In Spain, Erasmian ideas joined the existing current of *alumbrado* spirituality, which was moving through educated Aristocrats and simple *contadores* alike.¹¹⁸ This movement emphasized “religious individualism founded on the illumination of the spirit as the sole source of truth, in opposition to the official doctrines of the Church.”¹¹⁹ Out of this milieu emerged reform-minded individuals such as Juan de Valdés (1509/10-1541).

Although Simler’s *Oratio* only refers to Valdés in passing, there is no doubt that the Spaniard exerted influence on Vermigli’s theological development.¹²⁰ Simler writes: “the first praise for this (Neapolitan) church is due to Valdés.”¹²¹ In this group of disciples were

¹¹⁵ Barry Collett, *Italian Benedictine Scholars and the Reformation: The Congregation of Santa Giustina of Padua*, Oxford Historical Monographs (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985), 127.

¹¹⁶ Church, *The Italian Reformers, 1534-1564*, 53.

¹¹⁷ Concerning this period’s emphasis on Scripture, Elisabeth Gleason asserts, “Foremost was the focus on ethical and moral reform of the individual Christian who encountered God’s word in the Bible, specifically the Gospels and Pauline epistles...” Gleason, *Gasparo Contarini*, 191.

¹¹⁸ Erasmus exerted an especially strong influence in Spain, so much that McNair uses the word “cult” to describe his popularity. McNair, *PMI*, 310.

¹¹⁹ Firpo, “Italian Reformation,” 353-364. Erasmus also had direct influence on the Peninsula. About this phenomenon, Grendler writes, “Joyful letters spread the message of Erasmus to Italy, and many men opened the Gospel and moved forward to the glory of Christ.” Grendler, “Religious Restlessness,” 29.

¹²⁰ Firpo, “Italian Reformation,” 353-364; McNair, *PMI*, 143; Juan de Valdés, *Valdés’ Two Catechisms: The Dialogue on Christian Doctrine and the Christian Instruction for Children*, ed. José C. Nieto, trans. William B. Jones and Carol D. Jones (Lawrence, KS: Coronado Press, 1981). Joseph C. McLelland makes this case in “Valdés and Vermigli: Spirituality and the Degrees of Reform,” in *Peter Martyr Vermigli and the European Reformations: Semper Reformanda*, ed. Frank A. James, III (Leiden: Brill, 2004), 238-250, esp. 245-250.

¹²¹ Simler, *Oratio*, in *Life, Letters, and Sermons*, 20. Salvatore Caponetto asserts, “Juan de Valdés (1509?-41) was one of the most important Christian thinkers of the sixteenth century and one of the greatest writers in the Castilian language prior to Miguel de Cervantes.” Caponetto, *Protestant Reformation*, 63.

high-ranking Italian prelates, women of nobility, and *Literati* who gathered around Valdés to study the Bible with particular attention to justification by faith alone.¹²² Pietro Carnesecchi, who was part of the Valdésian circle, described these gatherings as “*regno di Dio*” (the kingdom of God).¹²³ According to Simler, it was at this time when Vermigli acquired books by Martin Bucer and Ulrich Zwingli.¹²⁴ As study of Reformed teaching deepened, so did the friendship of Vermigli and Valdés.¹²⁵

During this period, it was increasingly common for Protestant tracts, which questioned Catholic doctrine, to circulate through southern Europe. Juan de Valdés, in his *Dialogue in Christian Doctrine* (1529), for instance, quotes from the works of Luther, Melancthon, and Oecolampadius.¹²⁶ The history of Italian printing narrates the story in which the book-trade provided a “diffusion of writings by northern reformers and the fortunes of works on religious subjects by Italians.”¹²⁷ Anne J. Schutte, in her meticulous study of Italian *lettere volgari* (letters written by famous people in the Italian vernacular during the mid-sixteenth century),¹²⁸ demonstrates that Protestant texts popularized

¹²² So Paul Grendler, “Evangelism included a desire to reform abuses, emphasis on Scripture, and the primacy of justification through faith without the omission of good works.” Grendler, “Religious Restlessness,” 27. For more on this movement see Carlos Gilly, “Juan de Valdés: Übersetzer und Bearbeiter von Luthers Schriften in seinem *Diálogo de Doctrina*,” *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte* 74 (1983): 257-258; José C. Nieto, “The Changing Image of Valdés,” in *Valdés' Two Catechisms: The Dialogue on Christian Doctrine and the Christian Instruction for Children*, ed. José C. Nieto, trans. William B. Jones and Carol D. Jones (Lawrence, KS: Coronado Press, 1993), 51-125.

¹²³ Nieto, *Juan de Valdés and the Origins*, 148. Firpo describes Valdés’ role in Naples as “spiritual director and proselytizer for a message capable making use of diverse instruments and approaches: from personal encounters and colloquies to the clandestine circulation of his writing, from the epistolary exchange to the spoken word from the pulpit.” Firpo, “Italian Reformation,” 359.

¹²⁴ Simler, *Oratio*, in *Life, Letters, and Sermons*, 20.

¹²⁵ Karl Benrath, *Bernardino Ochino, of Siena: A Contribution Towards the History of the Reformation*, trans. Helen Zimmern (New York: Robert Carter & Brothers, 1877), 62. Pietro Carnesecchi confirmed the nature of this friendship at his Inquisition trial where he stated that Valdés was “*molto amico*.” Ortolani, *Pietro Carnesecchi*, 237.

¹²⁶ Firpo, “Italian Reformation,” 353-364. Firpo makes his case on the basis of Gilly, “Juan de Valdés: Übersetzer und Bearbeiter,” 257-305.

¹²⁷ Gleason, “On the Nature,” 14. Pietro Tacchi Venturi, *Storia della Compagnia di Gesù in Italia*, vol. 1 (Rome: La Civiltà cattolica, 1950), 433., quoted by Elisabeth Gleason, “Sixteenth-century Italian Interpretations of Luther,” *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte* 60 (1969): 168. For a more recent treatment see Costanzo Cargnoni et al., *Storia della spiritualità italiana*, ed. Pietro Zovatto (Rome: Città Nuova Editrice, 2002), 292-296.

¹²⁸ Schutte, “*Lettere Volgari*,” 639-688. With the exception of Rome, most letters in this corpus come from the northern half of the peninsula (*ibid.*, 670.). Nevertheless, our research

Evangelical values, especially the doctrine of justification, beyond clerical circles into the lower social classes.¹²⁹

E. Italian *Evangelisme* and the Doctrine of Justification

The *Evangelisme* movement gained momentum between the years 1536 to 1540, particularly in cities such as Venice, Modena, Verona, Lucca, Siena, and Naples. The dissemination of these reform-minded ideas was fueled by travelling preachers whose combination of traditional values (e.g., prayer, repentance and devotional practice in the vein of *De Imitatione Christi*) with fresh, Protestant-friendly emphases such as salvation grounded in faith alone, reached down into the lay level.¹³⁰

It was on the grassroots level that the profile of renewal in Italy gained recognition by a variety of indigenous groups. This included, “The Oratory of Divine Love” (also called the “Theatines”), an informal society of devout Catholics who were dedicated to improving moral life in Rome and beyond.¹³¹ There were also the “Barnabites,” or “Clerks Regular of St.

confirms that the constituent elements of Italian *Evangelisme* in the north (ibid., 662.) were also shared by the south, as in the work of Valdés and Benedetto.

¹²⁹ She writes, “Many literate Italians had ample opportunity to acquaint themselves with Protestant ideas, since in the 1520’s and 1530’s a number of works by Northern Reformers circulated freely in Italy....” Ibid., 643. McNair goes so far as to assert that, “Wherever the doctrine of Justification by Faith took root in pre-Tridentine Italy—whether in Lucca, Modena, Naples, Padua, Venice, or Viterbo—it was preceded by Lutheran, Zwinglian, or Calvinist tracts which the timely invention of printing had disseminated far and wide” (McNair, *PMI*, 8). Perhaps a more balanced explanation, one that gives adequate attention to the indigenous elements of Italian reform, is Dermot Fenlon’s statement: “Evangelism was not created by the Reformation; it was most certainly re-directed by it” (Fenlon, *Heresy and Obedience*, 19).

¹³⁰ Philip McNair, “New Light on Ochino,” *Bibliothèque d’humanisme et Renaissance: Travaux et documents* 35 (1973): 290-300.

¹³¹ Founded by Gaetano di Thiene (1480-1547), this group was established as an official order by Pope Clement VII in 1524 by the papal bull, *Exponi nobis*. Members of this group included Gian Matteo Giberti (later Cardinal-bishop of Verona), Giacomo Sadoletto (Cardinal-bishop of Carpentras, France), and Gianpetro Caraffa (Cardinal-bishop of Naples, later Pope Paul IV, prominent *zelanti* leader and catalyst of the Italian Inquisition) Frederic Church, *The Italian Reformers*, 21-22. There is evidence that co-founder Gaetano de Thiene (1480-1547) listened to Peter Martyr preach from the pulpit of San Pietro ad Aram in the years 1537-40. John C. Olin, *The Catholic Reformation: Savonarola to Ignatius Loyola; Reform in the Church 1495-1540* (New York: Harper & Row, 1969), 128.

Paul,” whose members preached, heard confessions, and visited hospitals.¹³² The Capuchins, which started as an attempt to renew the Franciscan Order, also arose during this period.¹³³ A papal commission for reform was proposed by Pope Paul III, *de emendanda ecclesia*, which sought to strengthen the integrity of curial offices.¹³⁴ Through its main exponents, Cardinals Contarini, Cortese, Pole, and Morone, the council exercised influence upon “the higher reaches of the Roman Church.”¹³⁵ Philip McNair argues persuasively that Vermigli served as a theological consultant to Contarini and the Commission during this time (1536-1537).¹³⁶ Also in the upper echelons of church authority was the *Spirituali*, which included most of the above mentioned prelates, and other intellectuals, noblewomen and ecclesiastical powerbrokers.¹³⁷ So significant was this group, that none other than Michelangelo is said to have been converted by their ministry, particularly by the influence

¹³² Founded by Antonio Maria Zaccaria (1502-1547) et al., the order was accepted by Clement VII in 1533 before Pope Paul III officially recognized them in 1535. Michael A. Mullett, *The Catholic Reformation* (London: Routledge, 1999), 73.

¹³³ Steven E. Ozment, *The Age of Reform, 1250-1550: An Intellectual and Religious History of Late Medieval and Reformation Europe* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1980), 404. The Discalced Carmelites and Society of Jesus also emerged during this era. While originating in Spain, their influence quickly traveled to Italy. The “Discalced” Carmelites (“without shoes,” actually, they wore sandals) was a women’s movement led by St. Teresa Avila (1515-1582). Teresa influenced St. John of the Cross (1542-1591) to found the first monastery of Discalced Carmelite Friars. Keith J. Egan, “The Spirituality of the Carmelites,” in *Christian Spirituality: High Middle Ages and Reformation*, ed. Jill Raitt, Bernard McGinn, and John Meyendorff (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1987), 50-62. For a helpful overview of the Jesuits during this period, see John W. O’Malley, *The First Jesuits* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1993).

¹³⁴ The commission issued a report on March 9, 1537 titled *Consilium de emendanda ecclesia* (“Plan for Reforming the Church”), which was later adopted as the group’s name. Frederic Church, *The Italian Reformers*, 21-22. Gleason, *Gasparo Contarini*, 142-144.

¹³⁵ Fenlon, *Heresy and Obedience*, 19.

¹³⁶ McNair, *PMI*, 116-138.

¹³⁷ While sometimes used as a synonym for “Evangelism,” Prosperi and Bowd argue that it is anachronistic to employ the nomenclature of “Spirituali” to describe the movement of Italian reform prior to 1540. For an examination of the diachronic use of the term see Stephen D. Bowd, *Reform before the Reformation: Vincenzo Querini and the Religious Renaissance in Italy*, *Studies in Medieval and Reformation Thought* 87 (Leiden: Brill, 2002), 144-145; Adriano Prosperi, *Tra evangelismo e controriforma: G. M. Giberti (1495-1543)*, *Uomini e dottrine* 16 (Rome: Edizioni di storia e letteratura, 1969), 285-286, 314-315. Notable (clerical) members of the *Spirituali* were Cardinal Gasparo Contarini, Cardinal Reginald Pole, Cardinal Giacomo Sadoletto, Cardinal Giovanni Morone, Abbot Gregorio Cortese of San Giorgio in Venice, Tommaso Badia (Master of the sacred palace), Bishop Gian Matteo Giberti of Verona, and Archbishop Federico Fregoso of Salerno. Background on each of these men is found in Church, *The Italian Reformers, 1534-1564* and in Caponetto, *Protestant Reformation*.

of Pole and Valdés.¹³⁸ These prominent leaders gathered at Pole's residence in Viterbo (the so called *Ecclesia Viterbiensis*) where they studied the Bible alongside of Bucer's commentary on *Saint Matthew* and *Romans*, Luther on the *Psalms*,¹³⁹ and Don Benedetto's *Beneficio di Cristo*.

Perhaps the most public exponent of Italian *Evangelisme* was Cardinal Gasparo Contarini (1483-1542). He is especially important in understanding *Evangelisme's* interest in the doctrine of justification. While much can be said about his career as an imperial diplomat, his elevation to the cardinalate, his advocacy of the new Jesuit order, and his involvement in the Colloquy of Regensburg, we will confine ourselves to the parts of his story that most directly relate to the soteriological focus of *Evangelisme*.¹⁴⁰

By the latter half of the 1530's, when Pope Paul III had made Cardinals of Contarini (1535) and Reginald Pole (1536), a commitment to justification by faith alone had solidified for these men and for several of their colleagues in the Roman Curia.¹⁴¹ The notion of God's sufficiency in salvation was central, based on the study of Scripture.¹⁴² With the increase of Bible study, there developed a greater concern for the doctrine of justification, the study of which sent them probing more deeply into the Bible.¹⁴³ This cycle fueled the engine of

¹³⁸ John T. Paoletti and Gary M. Radke, *Art in Renaissance Italy* (New York: Harry N. Abrams, 1997), 404. In his book *Michelangelo: A Tormented Life*, Antonio Forcellino contends that Michelangelo was a member of the *Spirituali* (trans. Allan Cameron [Cambridge, UK: Polity Press, 2009], 8).

¹³⁹ For an explanation of how *spirituali* members like Caraffa, who eventually championed the *zelanti* cause, cooperated with more amiable advocates of reform among the *spirituali* (i.e., Contarini and Pole) before the Italian Inquisition started in 1542, see Fenlon, *Heresy and Obedience*, 24-44.

¹⁴⁰ For an overview of Contarini's life and major contributions, see Gleason, *Gasparo Contarini*; Mackensen, "Contarini's Theological Role at Ratisbon in 1541," 36-49; Peter Matheson, *Cardinal Contarini at Regensburg* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972). Prior to Gleason's volume, the standard full-length work was by Franz Dittrich, *Gasparo Contarini, 1483-1542: Eine Monographie* (Braunschweig: Verlag der Ermländischen Zeitungs und Verlagsdruckerei, 1885).

¹⁴¹ Among the others were Federigo Fregoso (made Cardinal in 1539) and Gian Matteo Giberti (made Cardinal in 1543). Fenlon, *Heresy and Obedience*, 34-35.

¹⁴² Such study is noted as having a redemptive historical focus, "God's continuous dealings with mankind in history." Ibid., 31.

¹⁴³ During the same year as the Colloquy of Regensburg, Gasparo Contarini wrote his *Epistola de iustificatione* (1541) in which he articulated a *duplex iustitia* on justification that distinguishes righteousness that is credible in the sight of God versus righteousness that is credible in the eyes of men. See Friedrich Hünemann (ed.) "Cardinal Gasparao Contarini, Bishop of Belluno

Italian *Evangelisme*. A suitable slogan for this activity, one that was familiar to Contarini and Pole, was the phrase “*Dominus opus habet*.”¹⁴⁴ The Lord is ultimately responsible for salvation, not men. At the end of the day, man would stand before God “with only his faith in the cross and the merits of Christ to offer him hope of salvation.”¹⁴⁵

The seriousness of Contarini’s view of salvation was tested in 1541 when Charles V convened a colloquy at Regensburg. On April 21, the emperor announced the names of the Catholic and Protestant debaters. Philip Melanchthon, Martin Bucer, and Johann Pistorius presented the Protestant position, with John Calvin present on the sideline. Representing the Roman Catholic side were Johann Eck, Johann Gropper, and Julius Pflug. Also present but inactive was the Catholic Dutchman, Albert Pighius, who would become an important interlocutor of Peter Martyr on the topic of justification.¹⁴⁶ Cardinal Gasparo Contarini presided as papal legate on behalf of Pope Paul III.¹⁴⁷ The theological meeting, which started on April 27, came to be called the Colloquy of Regensburg.

A sufficient amount of material has been published concerning the Colloquy of Regensburg’s aims and outcomes, so that it is unnecessary to retell the full story here.¹⁴⁸

(*Gegenreformatrische Schriften* (1530c.-1542)“ *Corpus Catholicorum* 7, (Münster in Westfalen, 1923), 24.

¹⁴⁴ This phrased was employed by Pole after it was first used by a certain Benedictine monk named “Marco,” a lecturer from Padua who exercised particular influence on some the *Spirituali* members. *Ibid.*, 34.

¹⁴⁵ Gleason, *Gasparo Contarini*, 275. James Ross summarizes Contarini’s soteriological priorities in terms of a “firm belief in the total inadequacy of human penance, faith in the saving merits of Christ crucified, and hope in the loving mercy of God.” Ross, “Gasparo Contarini and His Friends,” 208.

¹⁴⁶ James, “Complex of Justification,” 45-58. In Emidio Campi, Frank A. James, III, and Peter Opitz, eds., *Peter Martyr Vermigli: Humanism, Republicanism, Reformation* (Geneva: Librairie Droz, 2002). Vermigli’s main interlocutors in his writing on justification are Pighius, Richard Smith, and the Council of Trent.

¹⁴⁷ Matheson, *Cardinal Contarini at Regensburg*, 93-94. Evidence indicates that Contarini originally asked Vermigli to represent the Catholic delegation at the Colloquy of Worms in 1540 before it was reconvened in 1541 to coincide with the Imperial diet. McNair, *PMI*, 197-199.

¹⁴⁸ See Hastings Eells, “The Origin of the Regensburg Book,” *The Princeton Theological Review* 26, no. 3 (1928): 355-372; Gleason, *Gasparo Contarini*, 225-235; Anthony N. S. Lane, *Justification by Faith in Catholic-Protestant Dialogue: An Evangelical Assessment* (London: T & T Clark, 2002); Anthony N. S. Lane, “A Tale of Two Imperial Cities: Justification at Regensburg (1541) and Trent (1546-1547),” in *Justification in Perspective: Historical Developments and Contemporary Challenges*, ed. Bruce L. McCormack (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2006), 119-145; Brian Lugioyo, *Martin Bucer’s Doctrine of Justification: Reformation Theology and Early Modern Irenicism*,

The primary lesson for our purposes concerns the agreement that the fifth article on the doctrine of justification reached between Catholics and Protestants.¹⁴⁹ Such agreement illustrates the relative freedom with which Catholic theologians were allowed to consider and formulate the doctrine of justification in the early decades of the sixteenth century.¹⁵⁰ This was so at least until 1542, when the Italian Inquisition started, or, more definitely, until the first period of the Council of Trent (1545-1547) when the *Decree on Justification* was written (January 13, 1547).¹⁵¹ In response to the question of whether justification is forensic (based upon an *iusitia alienum*) or an ongoing work of love and charity (based on an *iusitia inhaerens*), Regensburg asserted that it was both. In justification, God imparts righteousness by the Holy Spirit and he forensically imputes Christ's righteousness.¹⁵² Such imputation is necessary to make one right before the throne of God's justice since the imperfection of one's inherent righteousness falls short of the divine standard. This clear statement of imputation is responsible for making the article a significant concession by the Catholic side and fundamentally acceptable to Protestants.¹⁵³

Robert Ives suggests that the key statement of Article Five is probably, *per fidem vivam & efficacem iustificari peccatorem*.¹⁵⁴ Here the living and efficacious faith of the sinner is defined as the movement of the Holy Spirit by which one enjoys the "remission of sins and

Oxford Studies in Historical Theology (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), 103-208; Mackensen, "Contarini's Theological Role at Ratisbon in 1541;" Matheson, *Cardinal Contarini at Regensburg*.

¹⁴⁹ For a detailed analysis of the Latin text of Article five with commentary and English translation see A. N. S. Lane, "Calvin and Article 5 of the Regensburg Colloquy," in *Calvinus Praeceptor Ecclesiae: Papers of the International Congress on Calvin Research, Princeton, August 20-24, 2002*, ed. Herman J. Selderhuis (Geneva: Librairie Droz, 2004), 234.

¹⁵⁰ Abigail Brundin and Matthew Treherne describe Catholics and Protestants both holding ardent positions of *sola fide*. Abigail Brundin and Matthew Treherne, eds., *Forms of Faith in Sixteenth-century Italy* (Aldershot, UK: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2009), 3-4.

¹⁵¹ John W. O'Malley, *Trent: What Happened at the Council* (Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2013), 104, 108-109.

¹⁵² While the term *duplex iustitia* is not made explicit, the concept underlies the length of the article.

¹⁵³ A. N. S. Lane agrees with Matheson and Fenlon on this point. *Justification by Faith*, 57.

¹⁵⁴ Martin Bucer, *Acta colloquii in commitiis Imperii Ratisponae habiti, hoc est articuli de religione conciliati, & non conciliati omnes, ut ab Imperatore ordinibus Imperii ad iudicandum, & deliberandum propositi sunt. Consulta & deliberata de his actis Imperatoris singulorum ordinum Imperii & legati Romani* (Strasbourg: Wendelin Rihel, 1541), 6.

reconciliation on account of the merits of Christ, through the free goodness of God.”¹⁵⁵ Since the merit of Christ is the ultimate ground of justification, it is “not on account of our own worthiness or works.”¹⁵⁶ Precisely because of this emphasis on Christ’s righteousness, which is imputed to the believer, the Protestants at Regensburg could embrace the final version of Article Five.¹⁵⁷ Although conservative Catholics such as Eck were not pleased with the Protestant flavor of the article, there were some from the Catholic camp that approved. Among this group was Contarini. Writing later to Contarini, his confidant Reginald Pole “likened the formula to a partly concealed pearl, always possessed by the Church, but now accessible to everyone. Expressing wonder over the Catholic endorsement of the Article, Calvin wrote to Farel on May 11, 1541:

You will be astonished, I am sure, that our opponents have yielded so much.... Our friends have thus retained also the substance of the true doctrine, so that nothing can be comprehended within it which is not to be found in our writings.¹⁵⁸

It is important to note that Article Five does not teach *duplex iustificatio* (double justification). Some interpreters have confused this with the concept of *duplex iustitia* (double righteousness). Frank James makes this error when he asserts, “Pighius supported the doctrine of double justification as articulated at the Colloquy of Ratisbon/Regensburg (1541), which he attended.”¹⁵⁹ Unlike the standard *duplex iustificatio* of Catholic teaching, which is built upon initial justification of the sinner (*iustificatio impii*), by faith apart from preparatory works, and a second justification (*iustificatio pii*), by works (*operum*),

¹⁵⁵ “Quod remissionem peccatorum et reconciliationem propter meritum Christi gratuita Dei bonitate acceperunt.” Ibid.

¹⁵⁶ In context, “Et sic fide in Christum iustificamur seu reputamur iusti, id est accepti per ipsius merita, “non propter nostram dignitatem aut opera.” Ibid.

¹⁵⁷ Wilhelm Schenk, *Reginald Pole, Cardinal of England* (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1950), 102.

¹⁵⁸ John Calvin to Guillaume Farel, May 11, 1541, in *Letters of John Calvin*, trans. and ed. Jules Bonnet, vol. 1 (Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication, 1858), 260. Months later Calvin wrote negatively about the overall Colloquy of Regensburg, but he mentions nothing of Article 5. Calvin to Viret (3 or 13 of August). John Calvin to Guillaume Farel, May 11, 1541, in *ibid.*, 278-279.

¹⁵⁹ Vermigli, *Predestination and Justification*, 182 n460. McGrath explains why it is incorrect to assign the term “double justification” to the position of Gropper and Pighius. “There is no question of a ‘double formal cause of justification’; simply the recognition that both notions of righteousness are involved in justification.” Alister E. McGrath, *Reformation Thought: An Introduction*, 4th ed. (West Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell, 2012), 133.

expounded on the basis of *James* chapter two, the final draft of Article Five teaches that there is only *one* justification,¹⁶⁰ the ultimate ground of which is the merit of Christ (*accepti per ipsius merita*). Accordingly, justification is a work for which God is ultimately responsible, something he accomplishes by simultaneously imparting the Holy Spirit and imputing Christ's righteousness.¹⁶¹ As we shall see, this is the essence of Peter Martyr's doctrine.

F. Vermigli's Doctrine of Justification

Only a modest amount of attention has been dedicated to Peter Martyr's doctrine of justification. Charles Schmidt, writing in the mid-nineteenth century, was among the first modern scholars to do so.¹⁶² While Schmidt's treatment is general, he elucidates the notion of internal renewal by the Spirit as a constitutive element of Vermigli's position: "This doctrine [of justification] is the beginning, source and support of all piety."¹⁶³ More focused by comparison is the work of Philip McNair, which evaluates Vermigli's doctrine from various encounters on the Italian peninsula, particularly with Juan de Valdés and members of the Italian *Spirituali* such as Gasparo Contarini.¹⁶⁴ McNair argues that it was in this context that Peter Martyr originally accepted *sola fide*.¹⁶⁵ In fact, not only did Vermigli embrace the idea, according to McNair, he proceeded to teach it publicly in the city of Lucca.¹⁶⁶

While most of Joseph McLelland's research has focused on Vermigli's sacramental theology, he has argued that Vermigli's view of justification properly revolves around the notion of union with Christ:¹⁶⁷ "There is no doubt that this doctrine of union with Christ is

¹⁶⁰ Unlike the Catholic and Protestant varieties of *duplex iustificatio*, Article Five teaches that indwelling and imputed righteousness occur "*simul*."

¹⁶¹ Article 5.1-3 in Lane, *Justification by Faith*, 233.

¹⁶² A treatment of Vermigli's *Romans locus* on justification is found in Schmidt, *Peter Martyr Vermigli: Leben und ausgewählte Schriften*, 113-117.

¹⁶³ *Ibid.*, 113. "Diese Lehre ist Umfang, Quelle und Stütze aller Frömmigkeit."

¹⁶⁴ McNair, *PMI*. See especially chapter six, "Peter Martyr in Naples, 1537-1540" (139-179).

¹⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, 179. Thus McNair concludes his chapter with a memorable summary of Vermigli's evangelical doctrine, "Though the man who set out for Ravenna [from Naples] in the spring of 1540 was half mortified by fever he was wholly justified by faith."

¹⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, 229.

¹⁶⁷ McLelland, *Visible Words of God*, 113.

the dynamic of Peter Martyr's theology."¹⁶⁸ In keeping with this emphasis, McLelland identifies a two-fold righteousness understanding of justification in which a forensic declaration of imputed righteousness is its initial and primary definition, followed by a "second righteousness" consisting in the sanctifying work of the Spirit.¹⁶⁹

Klaus Sturm proposes a similar portrait of two-fold righteousness in his treatment of Peter Martyr's theology during the Italian's first stay in Strasbourg (1542-1547).¹⁷⁰ Sturm's work represents the only thoroughgoing analysis of Vermigli's doctrine of justification from this period, particularly from his *Genesis* commentary.¹⁷¹ Sturm argues that on account of Vermigli's upbringing in the Roman Church, "Martyr's soteriology, ecclesiastically developed, certainly has a distinct affinity for the basic ideas of Catholicism."¹⁷² In fact, Sturm goes so far as to label Vermigli a "*Reformkatholic*" for the way he orients internal renewal under the aegis of justification.¹⁷³ With regard to this position, Sturm acknowledges that Martyr flatly repudiated the sort of two-fold righteousness that posits two *correlative* causes. Thus he writes, "Martyr expressly rejected this opinion in order to categorically avoid relativizing Christ's righteousness appropriated in faith, which God imputes for forgiveness of sins and to admit only one 'causa' for justification: the mercy of God."¹⁷⁴ However, Sturm suggests that Vermigli maintained another sort of double righteousness, such that "In the final analysis, it seems to me that Martyr's doctrine of justification concurs with that of Contarini...."¹⁷⁵ So Catholic-friendly was this view, according to Sturm, that it is "difficult to

¹⁶⁸ Ibid., 142.

¹⁶⁹ Ibid., 128, 144, 176.

¹⁷⁰ Sturm, *Die Theologie Peter Martyr*.

¹⁷¹ Vermigli's *Genesis* commentary is also considered by Emidio Campi, "Genesis Commentary: Interpreting Creation," in *A Companion to Peter Martyr Vermigli*, ed. W. J. Torrance Kirby, Emidio Campi, and Frank A. James, III (Leiden: Brill, 2009), 209-229.

¹⁷² Martyrs ekklesiologisch entfaltete soteriologie hat durchaus eine merkliche Affinität zu Katholischen Grundgedanken." Sturm, *Die Theologie Peter Martyr*, 44.

¹⁷³ Ibid., 69.

¹⁷⁴ Ibid., 67-68. With reference to the "*doppelten Rechtfertigung*", he writes: "Diese Auffassung lehnt Martyr ausdrücklich ab, um die im Glauben angeeignete Gerechtigkeit Christi, die Gott zur Sündenvergebung anrechnet, radikal vor der Relativeierung zu schützen und nur eine "causa" der Rechtfertigung, die Barherzigkeit Gottes, zuzulassen."

¹⁷⁵ Ibid., 69. "Im Ergebnis scheint mir Martyrs Rechtfertigungslehre... mit der Contarinis übereinzustimmen."

determine whether Martyr's doctrine of justification would be justifiably condemned on the basis of Trent's canons on justification. . . ."¹⁷⁶ Our next chapter will examine whether this is in fact true.

Marvin Anderson briefly analyzes Vermigli's doctrine of justification in two articles, the substance of which also appears in his book, *Peter Martyr, a Reformer in Exile*.¹⁷⁷ Anderson's main contribution lies in identifying the patristic sources that undergird Vermigli's doctrine. Among his observations, he notes how Vermigli lines up numerous church fathers to support the notion of *sola fide*, especially Augustine and Chrysostom.¹⁷⁸ Anderson also emphasizes the pastoral thrust of Vermigli's doctrine of justification, which is "the gateway to a new life in Christ."¹⁷⁹ Finally, it is worth noting that Anderson locates Peter Martyr's doctrine of justification, particularly as it is expressed in his *Romans* commentary (1558), "as part of a conciliatory genre originating with Contarini, Cortese, Pole, Sadoletto, Seripando and other Paulinians of Sixteenth Century Italy."¹⁸⁰ This is consonant with the conclusions of our research.

Another treatment of Peter Martyr's doctrine of justification is found in John Patrick Donnelly's book, *Calvinism and Scholasticism in Vermigli's Doctrine of Man and Grace*.¹⁸¹ Concentrating exclusively on the *Romans locus* (over the smaller and less mature *loci* on justification from Martyr's *Genesis* and *1 Corinthians* commentaries), Donnelly recognizes "that the doctrine of justification by faith alone is crucial for Martyr as for all the Reformers."¹⁸² As the title of his monograph suggests, Donnelly is especially interested in

¹⁷⁶ *ibid.* "Es ist wirklich schwer zu beurteilen, ob Martyrs Rechtfertigungslehre der Verurteilung nach dem Maßstab der Trienter Canones de iustificatione. . . ."

¹⁷⁷ Anderson, *Peter Martyr, a Reformer in Exile*, 60-61, 270-278, 323-326, 335-342, 346-353. The two articles are: Marvin W. Anderson, "Word and Spirit in Exile (1542-1562): The Biblical Writings of Peter Martyr Vermigli," *Journal of Ecumenical Studies* 21 (1970): 193-201, and Marvin W. Anderson, "Peter Martyr on Romans," *Scottish Journal of Theology* 26 (1973): 401-420.

¹⁷⁸ Anderson, "Peter Martyr on Romans," 405. He also highlights agreement between Vermigli and Cranmer on the subject based on their common patristic citations, 414.

¹⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, 413.

¹⁸⁰ Anderson, *Peter Martyr, a Reformer in Exile*, 274. This is located in the section of Anderson's book titled "*sola fide*."

¹⁸¹ Donnelly, *Calvinism and Scholasticism*, 149-155.

¹⁸² *Ibid.*, 149.

analyzing the scholastic elements of Vermigli's doctrine.¹⁸³ In keeping with his overall thesis that Vermigli was a "Calvinist Thomist,"¹⁸⁴ Donnelly argues that Vermigli repudiated the Protestant doctrines of *simul iustus et peccator*,¹⁸⁵ perseverance of the Saints,¹⁸⁶ and irresistible grace, since he does not use the terminology.¹⁸⁷ However, James points out that Vermigli, like Calvin, maintains these doctrinal concepts, even though he does not employ the nomenclature.¹⁸⁸

It is noteworthy that Donnelly agrees with McLelland's thesis that Vermigli closely aligned the doctrines of justification and union with Christ.¹⁸⁹ In this connection, Donnelly recognizes in Peter Martyr the distinctively Protestant doctrine of "imputed justice," while also observing a "second inherent justice."¹⁹⁰ Because this second form of righteousness, expressed through good works, fails to meet the divine standard of justice, it is buttressed by the imputation of Christ's righteousness. On account of this distinction, Donnelly acknowledges that, "In teaching a second justice or sanctification, Martyr fits easily into the mainstream of Protestant tradition."¹⁹¹ On the other hand, because he reads Vermigli as rejecting *simul iustus et peccator*, perseverance, and irresistible grace, Donnelly regards his doctrine as retaining "many Catholic nuances which Luther and Calvin left behind."¹⁹²

Frank James has dedicated the greatest amount of attention to Peter Martyr's doctrine of justification. Similar to Thomas Sheridan's volume vis-à-vis Newman's doctrine, James's doctoral dissertation, "*De Iustificazione: The Evolution of Peter Martyr Vermigli's Doctrine of*

¹⁸³ Ibid., 156. Of interest to us (for the way it contrasts Newman's understanding) is Martyr's agreement with Aquinas's on the functional value of hope as a "habit." We will examine this concept more closely in the next chapter.

¹⁸⁴ Ibid., 197-207.

¹⁸⁵ Ibid., 154.

¹⁸⁶ Ibid., 154.

¹⁸⁷ Ibid., 159.

¹⁸⁸ James, "The Complex of Justification: Peter Martyr Vermigli Versus Albert Pighius," 51.

¹⁸⁹ Ibid., 157.

¹⁹⁰ Ibid., 160.

¹⁹¹ Ibid. Donnelly states that Martyr's doctrine on sanctification compares closely with that of John Calvin (footnote 119).

¹⁹² Ibid., 154. Donnelly also finds Vermigli's doctrine of perseverance less than Reformed and his position on irresistible grace to be "highly qualified" (159).

Justification,” shines a floodlight into a relatively obscure subject.¹⁹³ He meticulously examines the development of Peter Martyr’s thought on justification from Naples into the subsequent stages of his life and ministry by analysing Peter Martyr’s three main writings on the topic (the *loci* from his commentaries on *Genesis*, *1 Corinthians*, and *Romans*).¹⁹⁴ From this study he demonstrates that Vermigli’s doctrine underwent a maturation process that mirrored the trajectory of other Protestant theologians.¹⁹⁵

Throughout his investigation, James acknowledges that Vermigli’s conception of justification owed much to the lessons he had learned in Naples. Our next chapter will consider the extent to which this is true. We will argue that the Neapolitan influence not only established the foundation of Martyr’s doctrine; it also continued to define its shape into its most mature form. Since Frank James affirms the former but not the latter, this is an appropriate place to establish our agreement (at least) on the preparatory role of Martyr’s Italian background. Thus, underscoring the Protestant character of Martyr’s position before his exile, James writes:

The moment Vermigli embraced the doctrine of justification in Naples, his fate was sealed. . . . It also led him to a career as a Protestant theologian and staunch advocate of the doctrine he described as the “head, fountain and summit of all piety.”¹⁹⁶

¹⁹³ This was James’s second monograph on the doctrine of Peter Martyr, following his D.Phil thesis at Oxford, *Peter Martyr Vermigli and Predestination: the Augustinian Inheritance of an Italian Reformer*.

¹⁹⁴ After tracing Vermigli’s steps through Italy to his departure in 1542, James examines his years in Strasbourg (1542-1547), where he first addressed the doctrine of justification in his *Genesis* lectures. Next James examines this doctrine from Vermigli’s Oxford lectures on *1 Corinthians* (1548-1549) and then from his Oxford lectures on *Romans* (1550-1553). A concluding chapter compares and contrasts Peter Martyr’s mature doctrine of justification to other early Reformed theologians.

¹⁹⁵ In addition to his dissertation, James addresses the topic in “The Complex of Justification: Peter Martyr Vermigli Versus Albert Pighius,” and “Peter Martyr in Bucer’s Strassburg: The Early Formulations of His Doctrine of Justification,” *Perichoresis* 1, no. 2 (2003): 5-33. A cogent introduction is found in *Predestination and Justification: Two Theological Loci*, trans. and ed. Frank A. James, III, *The Peter Martyr Library* 8 (Kirksville, MO: Truman State University Press, 2003). Finally, one should consult James’s translation of Peter Martyr’s justification loci (from his *1 Corinthians* commentary) in “Justification and Faith,” in *PMR*, 133-150.

¹⁹⁶ James, “*De Iustificatione*,” 2-3.

Since comparison with Newman's doctrine of justification will eventually necessitate some consideration of Vermigli's position on the sacraments, it is valuable to recognize how it too was shaped by his pre-exilic experience. According to James:

By the time of his Priorate in Lucca, [Martyr] evinced a Protestant-like soteriology and had probably rejected a traditional view of the sacraments, yet he was unwilling to abandon the Catholic Church, that is, until compelled by the Roman Inquisition.¹⁹⁷

A final quotation from James on this point underscores the "unanimity" and "general consensus" of scholars on the question of whether the fundamental form of Vermigli's theology was established before he crossed the Alps.

Virtually all the research of the last twenty-five years, despite differences of interpretation, have [*sic*] reached unanimity on one question, namely, that Vermigli's theology was fundamentally formed before he apostatized from Italy. . . . There has been also a general consensus that, ever since Naples, he had embraced a Protestant-inspired doctrine of justification by faith alone.¹⁹⁸

By "theology," in this context, James refers specifically to Martyr's doctrine of the Eucharist and the authority of Scripture. On the question of how Vermigli's mature doctrine of justification resembled his Neapolitan background, for which, as James notes, there is a "general consensus," we shall argue that the logic of Vermigli's position was properly grounded in a two-fold righteousness.

G. Peter Martyr at Oxford

With this new, Protestant theology, Vermigli moved northward in May of 1541 to become prior of the rich and influential monastery on Saint Frediano in the Republic of Lucca. It was there that he initiated a series of educational and ecclesiastical reforms which, in the words of Philip McNair, amounted to an "ideological revolution; [so that] Lucca came perilously near to civic

¹⁹⁷ Ibid., 139.

¹⁹⁸ Ibid., 142-143, 144. James cites Philip McNair who argued that Vermigli had embraced "the doctrine of justification by faith alone" in Naples, *PMI*, 179. Cf. Donnelly, *Calvinism and Scholasticism*, 172.

reformation on the pattern of Calvin's Geneva."¹⁹⁹ But after a mere fifteen months of such reform, Pope Paul III hastened its demise by reinstituting the Roman Inquisition. Recognizing discretion as the better part of valor, Vermigli renounced his vows and made the difficult decision to flee his homeland.²⁰⁰ When he finally crossed through the Rhaetian Alps and arrived at Zurich in the fall of 1542, he was welcomed by Heinrich Bullinger (1504-1575), Konrad Pellikan (1478-1556) and Rodolph Gualter (or Gwalther, 1519-1586).²⁰¹ Unfortunately, there were no positions open in Zurich. After two days, Vermigli continued to Basel, where he remained for a month, enjoying hospitality from Oswald Myconius (1488-1552) and the generosity of Boniface Amerbach (1495-1562), who provided Martyr with books and money. Since Basel was also without an open academic post, Vermigli accepted an invitation to teach in Strasbourg, where he succeeded the late Wolfgang Capito as professor of Divinity.

Simler explains that it was "that good and learned man," Martin Bucer, who arranged for Vermigli's academic appointment to the College of Saint Thomas at Strasbourg.²⁰² The Italian exile was expected to "teach sacred letters," which he proceeded to do from the twelve books of the Minor Prophets, *Lamentations*, *Genesis*, *Exodus* and a large part of *Leviticus*.²⁰³ Of these lectures, it is only *Genesis* and *Lamentations* that are extant, the former of which containing

¹⁹⁹ Philip McNair, "Biographical Writings," in *Early Writings: Creed, Scripture and Church. The Peter Martyr Library 1.*, ed. Joseph C. McLelland (Kirkville, MO: Sixteenth Century Journal Publishers, 1994), 7.

²⁰⁰ It was on the basis of Matthew 10:23, which provides sanction for Christians to flee persecution that Peter Martyr and Bernardino Ochino chose to leave their beloved homeland. McLelland, *Visible Words of God*, 9. For an interesting treatment of Peter Martyr's theology of exile, see Jason Zuidema's recent article, "Flight from Persecution and the Honour of God in the Theology of Peter Martyr Vermigli." *Reformation and Renaissance Review* 15, no. 1 (2013): 112-116.

²⁰¹ Frank James has pointed out that this warm reception probably followed careful theological scrutiny, James, "*De Iustificazione*," 9.

²⁰² Josias Simler, *Life, Letters, and Sermons*, trans. and ed. John Patrick Donnelly, *The Peter Martyr Library* 5 (Kirkville, MO: Thomas Jefferson University Press, 1999), 28.

²⁰³ Ibid. In a personal letter to Heinrich Bullinger in 1551, Vermigli corroborates Simler's account by mentioning these books vis-à-vis his Strasbourg lectures (except for *Lamentations*). About them he writes, "But if it please God to spare my life, and I should obtain leisure, I shall not object to publish them. . . ." Peter Martyr Vermigli, "Letter CCXXXII, Peter Martyr to Henry Bullinger," in *Original Letters Relative to the English Reformation, 1531-1558*, ed. Hastings Robinson, vol. 2 (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1846-1847), 499.

the *locus* on the doctrine of justification.²⁰⁴ Frank James notes, “Certainly, upon his arrival, Vermigli’s theological perspective was judged acceptable to the Reformers of Strasbourg—indeed, it was compatible enough that he was immediately invited to lecture on the Old Testament.”²⁰⁵ With regard to the quality of his teaching, it wasn’t long before Vermigli ascended to the stature of Bucer, and, in the estimation of many, even surpassed him.²⁰⁶

Strasbourg was significant for another reason. It was there that Vermigli married a former nun from Metz named Catherine Dammartin, “a lover of true religion.”²⁰⁷ According to Philip McNair, the wedding probably occurred in October 1544.²⁰⁸ Known for her Christian virtue, Catherine was especially admired for her charity among the English with whom she and Peter Martyr lived most of their married life together. After eight years of marriage, she died childless in February 1553. Peter Martyr would later marry his second wife—another Katie—in May 1559.²⁰⁹

After five fruitful years of teaching in Strasbourg, Vermigli recognized the potential threat of doctrinal censuring (in what was to become the Augsburg Interim).²¹⁰ Thankfully, liberation arrived in an invitation from Archbishop Thomas Cranmer to help fortify the nascent Church of England with Protestant theology. McNair suggests that Vermigli’s motivation for accepting the invitation also consisted in “holy curiosity, the same impulse which was an

²⁰⁴ Sturm analyzes the *locus* on justification from Vermigli’s *Genesis* commentary in Sturm, *Die Theologie Peter Martyr*, 58-70. Martyr’s *locus* centered on *Genesis* 15:6, “And so he [Abram] believed the Lord and he reckoned it to him as righteousness.”

²⁰⁵ James, “*De Iustificatione*”, 155.

²⁰⁶ In Simler’s words, “[Vermigli] seemed in the judgment of all not just to match Bucer but to surpass him.” *Life, Letters and Sermons*, 29.

²⁰⁷ Metz was a Free Imperial City until 1552 when King Henry II of France and members of the Schmalkaldic League signed the Treaty of Chambord which gave it to the Kings of France. It has remained a French territory ever since. Presumably, Peter Martyr communicated with his wife in Latin.

²⁰⁸ McNair, “Early Writings,” 9.

²⁰⁹ *Ibid.*, 9-11. Martyr’s second wife, Caterina Merenda of Brescia, bore him two children who did not survive infancy. This was followed by a daughter, Maria, born on March 6, 1563 (after Peter Martyr’s death on November 12, 1562).

²¹⁰ Charles V’s victory at Mühlberg on April 24, 1547 over the Lutheran Schmalkaldic League was probably the handwriting on the wall. The Augsburg Interim became Imperial law on June 30, 1548.

ingredient in the compulsion that urged him to cross the Alps in 1542.”²¹¹ On November 4, 1547, with permission from the Strasbourg senate, Vermigli departed from Basel, accompanied by his *amico di vecchia data*, Bernardino Ochino.²¹² Their spouses eventually would follow them, escorted by their friend, Giulio Terenziano (known in England as “Julius”), in the beginning of the spring.²¹³ Joseph McLelland explains how the Strasbourg period was “a decisive phase for Martyr’s theology, for in England he was immediately put on the defensive and from that time until his death was engaged in drawing out the implications of his doctrine in the face of a variety of opponents.”²¹⁴ Toward this end, the recently crowned King Edward VI (February 20, 1547) approved Vermigli as Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford University and bestowed on him the honor of Doctor of Divinity.²¹⁵

While we tend to think of Oxford University as old and venerable, it should be remembered that the Regius Chair of Divinity at Oxford had only been established a few years earlier in 1540,²¹⁶ and the charter foundation for Christ Church, dated November 4, 1546, was issued just one year to the very day before Vermigli and Ochino departed from Basel to London.²¹⁷ Thus, Vermigli found himself in a new country, at a new academic institution, under

²¹¹ Philip McNair, “Peter Martyr in England,” in *Peter Martyr Vermigli and Italian Reform*, ed. Joseph C. McLelland (Waterloo, ON: Wilfred Laurier University Press, 1980), 89.

²¹² They arrived in London on December 20. Vermigli traveled under the aegis of John Abell, a merchant at Strasbourg, *Ibid.*, 90. Diarmaid MacCulloch, outlines details of this journey, including an important letter from Bucer to Cranmer which Vermigli and Ochino delivered upon arrival outlining their (Reformed) view of the Eucharist. Diarmaid MacCulloch, *Thomas Cranmer: A Life* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1996), 380-383.

²¹³ McNair, “Peter Martyr in England,” 96.

²¹⁴ McLelland, *Visible Words of God*, 13.

²¹⁵ Claire Cross, “Oxford and the Tudor State 1509-1558,” in *The Collegiate University*, ed. James McConica, vol. 3, *The History of the University of Oxford*, gen. ed. T. H. Aston (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986), 133-135.

²¹⁶ This date is potentially confusing. Philip McNair identifies 1546 as the founding of the Regius Chair of Divinity with Richard Smith occupying it (McNair, *Peter Martyr in England*, 93). However, G. D. Duncan has it starting with Smith at 1540, “Public Lectures and Professional Chairs,” in *The Collegiate University*, ed. James McConica, vol. 3, *The History of the University of Oxford*, gen. ed. T. H. Aston. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986), 343-347. The discrepancy is explained by the fact that after its initial establishment in 1540, financial arrangements were altered in 1546 from Westminster Cathedral to the newly constructed Christ Church.

²¹⁷ It was officially incorporated as “the cathedral church of Christ in Oxford” of King Henry VIII College. For an overview of this history, including an explanation of its origins vis-à-vis Wolsey’s Cardinal College, see James McConica, “The Rise of the Undergraduate College,” in *The Collegiate*

a new dean, among several new canons, and, perhaps most significantly, he was facing a new theological challenge.²¹⁸

Under King Edward VI and beside his Uncle, Edward Seymour, Duke of Somerset and Lord Protector (c. 1500-1552),²¹⁹ it was “through Archbishop Cranmer himself that a distinct evangelical stance entered England; this was eventually styled ‘Reformed’ Christianity. . . .”²²⁰ Peter Martyr and Martin Bucer (who arrived in the autumn of 1549 to occupy the Regius Chair at Cambridge)²²¹ were chosen for the expressed purpose of implementing this vision.²²² According to Diarmaid MacCulloch, “By late 1547, Martyr and Cranmer were already very close in theological outlook.”²²³ Even so, the challenge of their mission loomed large. In Martyr’s words, “Indeed I took upon myself a weighty charge.”²²⁴ This was despite the fact that, according to S. L. Greenslade, “Peter Martyr was unquestionably the most learned” of the early holders of the Regius Chair in Theology.²²⁵

When Peter Martyr took his post at Christ Church, he supplanted the previous occupant of the Regius Chair, Professor Richard Smith. Joseph McLelland describes Smith as a “model of inconstancy,” and, quoting John Strype, calls him “giddy and unstable,” and of “a profligate conscience.”²²⁶ McNair is more gracious by comparison, suggesting that when reading Smith in

University, ed. James McConica, Vol. 3, *The History of the University of Oxford*, gen. ed. Trevor Henry Aston. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986), 32-42.

²¹⁸ Strictly speaking, Christ Church is not a college, but rather a “foundation.” Richard Cox, the first Dean, is believed to have written its newly formed constitution. During this time, Cox also served as Chancellor of Oxford University, *Ibid.*, 37.

²¹⁹ Edward Seymour served as Protector until his deposition in October of 1549. He was followed by John Dudley, Earl of Warwick (who was made Duke of Northumberland in October 1551). On August 1553, after his failed attempt to install Lady Jane Grey and the accession of Queen Mary, Dudley was executed.

²²⁰ MacCulloch, *Thomas Cranmer: A Life*, 173.

²²¹ Cross, “Oxford and the Tudor State 1509-1558,” 134.

²²² McLelland, *Visible Words of God*, 16.

²²³ Diarmaid MacCulloch, “Peter Martyr and Thomas Cranmer,” in *Peter Martyr Vermigli: Humanism, Republicanism, Reformation*, ed. Emidio Campi, Frank A. James, III, and Peter Opitz (Geneva: Librairie Droz, 2002), 176.

²²⁴ McLelland, *Visible Words of God*, 17.

²²⁵ S. L. Greenslade, “The Faculty of Theology,” in *The Collegiate University*, ed. James McConica, vol. 3, *The History of the University of Oxford*, gen. ed. T. H. Aston (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986), 315.

²²⁶ McLelland, *Visible Words of God*. See footnote 44 on page 20.

depth “it is hard not to feel a sneaking sympathy with him.”²²⁷ Whatever one’s opinion of Smith’s character, the fact is that he quickly became one of Peter Martyr’s chief nemeses.

The *ad hominem* nature of Smith’s opposition of Vermigli, as evidenced in several invectives and diatribes, gives one the impression that he harbored a certain amount of resentment toward Martyr for his demotion.²²⁸ This first of these works came shortly after leaving Oxford in 1549, a treatise defending celibacy.²²⁹ The second work upheld the sanctity of monastic vows.²³⁰ McNair points to the highly visible nature of these traditions vis-à-vis Catholic piety as the reason for Smith’s selection of these topics.²³¹ In a letter to Bucer, Peter Martyr expressed the view that Smith’s book was “stuffed so full with maledictions, accusations, and the bitterest contempt, that I think I never have heard before of any tongue so unbridled in abuse.”²³² Eventually, Smith instigated the famous Oxford Disputation on the Eucharist.²³³ A final demonstration of Smith’s animus was his *Diatriba de hominis iustificatione . . . adversus P.M. Vermelinum*, published in 1550.²³⁴ Andreas Löwe’s comment on this work gives a sense of how significant the doctrine of justification had become in this period, “Smyth’s 1550 publication primarily sought to address the doctrinal innovations of his

²²⁷ McNair, “Peter Martyr in England,” 97.

²²⁸ J. Andreas Löwe, *Richard Smyth and the Language of Orthodoxy: Re-imagining Tudor Catholic Polemicism*, Studies in Medieval and Reformation Thought (Leiden: Brill, 2003). Löwe explains that Smith regularly attended Vermigli’s lectures, taking assiduous notes and occasionally causing a disturbance, (41).

²²⁹ Ibid., 152. This and the following treatise were published together in Richard Smith, *De coelibatu sacerdotum liber vnus. Eiusdem de votis monasticis liber alter, nunc primum typis excusi* (Lovanii: Apud Ioannem Waen, 1550).

²³⁰ According to Löwe, Smith “frequently accused Vermigli of breaking his vows in order to marry: ‘Who was released by breaking his vow (such a man is that Peter, who—they say—took monastic vows in Italy) to consider marriage unlaful in his mind and not admit that it was any crime of his.’” *Richard Smyth and the Language*, 153, footnote 37.

²³¹ McNair, “Peter Martyr in England,” 95-99.

²³² Gorham, *Gleanings*, 153-154. The letter is dated 10 June 1550.

²³³ The disputation grew out of Martyr’s exposition of *1 Corinthians* 10:16-17 in which he cast aspersions upon the traditional Catholic doctrine of the Lord’s Supper. The history of how the debate developed along with a modern English version of the treatise has been translated and edited by Joseph C. McLelland, *The Oxford Treatise and Disputation on the Eucharist, 1549*, trans. and ed. Joseph C. McLelland, *The Peter Martyr Library* 7 (Kirkville, MO: Truman State University Press, 2000).

²³⁴ Richard Smith, *Diatriba de hominis iustificatione...adversus P.M. Vermelinum* (Lovanii: Antonius Maria Bergaigne, 1550). While Smith’s title has Vermigli in the crosshairs, it is actually Luther and Melancthon who receive the lion’s share of attention.

home-country. . . that England had been corrupted wretchedly by the infection of many heresies among which justification by faith featured prominently.”²³⁵ Peter Martyr’s most significant response to Smith’s opposition was his exposition of the New Testament book of *Romans*, to which we now turn.

H. Peter Martyr’s *Locus* on Justification

Vermigli’s nearly six years in England were full and fruitful.²³⁶ He started to lecture on *Romans* in March 1550.²³⁷ According to Marvin Anderson, whose article “Peter Martyr on Romans” provides a general overview of the commentary’s scope and sequence, “Martyr viewed [the purpose of] his lectures as a means of reforming the English Church.”²³⁸ Toward this end, Vermigli sought to expound the text and explain its theological implications by means of two theological *loci*: one on the doctrine of predestination²³⁹ and the other on justification.²⁴⁰ The latter of these, *de iustificatione*, will be the object of our attention for understanding Vermigli’s doctrine.²⁴¹ We will focus here, over the earlier *loci* from his *Genesis* and *1 Corinthians*

²³⁵ Löwe, *Richard Smyth and the Language*, 120.

²³⁶ Donnelly calls them “the most influential period of [Vermigli’s] life.” *Calvinism and Scholasticism*, 3. Peter McNair identifies seven particular fronts on which Peter Martyr exerted influence during this period: (1.) The Eucharistic Disputation of 1549; (2.) Riots later the same year; (3.) The Vestrian Controversy; (4.) The Second Book of Common Prayer, published in 1552; (5.) The Ecclesiastical Laws (also in 1552); (6.) The Forty Two Articles of Religion of 1553; (7.) The Reformation Settlement after 1558. McNair, *Peter Martyr Vermigli*, 87.

²³⁷ Peter Martyr indicates in the preface of his commentary that even though he had read the *Romans* commentaries of Melanchthon, Bucer, Bullinger, and Calvin, he felt that it was nevertheless important to write his own commentary. Vermigli, *Romanos*, preface. “Primum Philippum Melanchthonem, virum eximium, qui eleganter & exquisita methodo non semel hanc epistolam explanavit. Postea Martinum Bucerum, non tantum summa pietate, ac eruditione in comparabili praeditum, verum quoad vixit, mecum amicitia dulcissima copulatum, in hanc eandem copiosum & doctum commentarium edidisse. Legeramque duo alia ecclesiae fulgentissima lumina, Bulyngerum, inquam, & Calvinum. . . . eaque de causa non erat, uti dixi, quod ego novae interpretationis cudendae laborem susciperem, cum ab aliis in hoc docendi genere iam satis superque factum esset.”

²³⁸ Anderson, “Peter Martyr on Romans,” 403.

²³⁹ *De Praedestinatione* is located immediately after Vermigli’s exegesis of *Romans* 9. For a study of this *locus* see Joseph C. McLelland, “The Reformed Doctrine of Predestination According to Peter Martyr,” *Scottish Journal of Theology* 8 (1955); James, *Peter Martyr Vermigli and Predestination*; Vermigli, *Predestination and Justification*.

²⁴⁰ *De Iustificatione* is located immediately after Vermigli’s exegesis of *Romans* 11.

²⁴¹ Vermigli, *In epistolam S. Pauli apostoli ad Romanos commentarii*. . . . (Basel: Apud Petrum Perna, 1560), 87-230, First Edition 1558. All references to Vermigli’s *Romans* commentary will cite

commentaries, because the *Romans locus* represents his most extensive and mature treatment.²⁴²

Despite the aforementioned similarities between Vermigli's doctrine of justification and the *Lectures* of John Henry Newman in our introduction, the genres of these respective volumes are in fact quite different. Because Newman's lectures on justification were part of his larger *via media* project, the finished product may be compared to a buckshot in the sense that it comprises a wide variety of theological topics. Vermigli's *locus*, by contrast, is like a bullet for its concentrated focus upon the doctrine of *sola fide*.

The *loci* method, which was experiencing a revival in Martyr's day, might also be likened to a surgical procedure for its relatively narrow scope and logical precision.²⁴³ More than any other figure, Aristotle (384-322 BC) is generally credited for having popularized the approach, followed by Cicero (106-43 BC), who encountered it in the Philosopher's *Topica*.²⁴⁴ This method also drew from the humanist tradition, represented by the likes of Lorenzo Valla (1407-57), with its trenchant historical, grammatical, and rhetorical analysis.²⁴⁵ In Vermigli's context, the writing of theological *loci* often amalgamated dialectical and rhetorical methodology.²⁴⁶ With regard to the former, it was a way to systematically direct argumentation by granting, denying, and admitting proof (*concedo, nego, admitto casum*). Concerning the latter, it brought the tools of exegesis to bear upon texts.

page numbers from his 1560 version (which is available on the *Digital Library of Classic Protestant Texts*) followed in brackets by pages from James's English translation. In his English text, James indicates the pagination of the original 1558 version.

²⁴² With Donnelly (*Calvinism and Scholasticism*, 149), James also takes this approach, "This is especially important because it establishes his understanding of justification toward the end of his life and career." James, *De Iustificazione*, 275.

²⁴³ For an overview of its history and development see Joseph C. McLelland, "A Literary History of the *LOCI COMMUNES*," in *A Companion to Peter Martyr Vermigli*, ed. W. J. Torrance Kirby, Emidio Campi, and Frank A. James, III (Leiden: Brill, 2009), 479-494.

²⁴⁴ The *Topica* of Aristotle is part of his *Organon*, a collection of logical works addressing principles and methods of presenting proof.

²⁴⁵ Cesare Vasoli, "Loci Communes and the Rhetorical and Dialectical Traditions," in *Peter Martyr Vermigli and Italian Reform*, ed. Joseph C. McLelland (Waterloo, ON: Wilfred Laurier University Press, 1980), 20-21.

²⁴⁶ Paul Oskar Kristeller, *Renaissance Thought: The Classic, Scholastic and Humanist Strains* (New York: Harper & Row, 1961), 92-119. This was the case, for instance, at institutions featuring a mixture of scholastic and humanist curricula, such as the University of Padua where Vermigli received his education, or Heidelberg University, from which Martin Bucer was influenced during his study at the Dominican monastery in Heidelberg. Greschat, *Martin Bucer*, 18-20

There is a long and significant debate on the relationship of scholastic and humanist methodology in Peter Martyr's work, the origin of which is typically associated with Brian Armstrong's portrait of Vermigli in his work, *Calvinism and the Amyraut Heresy* (1969).²⁴⁷ While an examination of the debate is outside the scope of our thesis, it bears mentioning. Armstrong argued that the Italian reformer, along with Theodore Beza and Girolamo Zanchi, modified the biblical vision of Calvin according to Aristotelian philosophy, resulting in a tradition of Reformed Scholasticism. It was nearly two decades until Richard Muller disputed Armstrong's thesis as overly simplistic, particularly in regard to the portrait of Calvin as the chief codifier of Reformed theology (ignoring the collegial involvement of Bullinger, Musculus, Vermigli, et al.) and the apparent equation of Aristotelian categories with fullblown "scholasticism."²⁴⁸

A few years before Muller's critique, John Patrick Donnelly appropriated much of Armstrong's case, concluding that Vermigli was a "Calvinist Thomist."²⁴⁹ On the other side of the spectrum from Donnelly was the position championed by Marvin Anderson, which stressed Vermigli's humanist orientation.²⁵⁰ Between them is Joseph C. McLelland's mediating position, which summarizes Vermigli's method as a synthesis: "Pietro Martire Vermigli above all," he writes, "provides a case study in the interaction between humanism and scholasticism. [He was] a Florentine who studied at Padua."²⁵¹ McLelland's *via media* is the predominant view in contemporary Vermigli scholarship and the one that this author finds most convincing.²⁵²

²⁴⁷ Brian G. Armstrong, *Calvinism and the Amyraut Heresy: Protestant Scholasticism and Humanism in Seventeenth-Century France* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1969), 87.

²⁴⁸ Richard A. Muller, *Post-Reformation Reformed Dogmatics* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 1987). See also Charles B. Schmitt, "Towards a Reassessment of Renaissance Aristotelianism," *History of Science* 11 (1973): 159-193.

²⁴⁹ John Patrick Donnelly, "Calvinist Thomism," *Viator* 7 (1976): 441-455 (452).

²⁵⁰ Anderson, "Biblical Humanism."

²⁵¹ Joseph C. McLelland, "Peter Martyr Vermigli: Scholastic or Humanist?," in *Peter Martyr Vermigli and Italian Reform*, ed. Joseph C. McLelland (Waterloo, Ontario: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1980), 141.

²⁵² Luca Baschera, "Aristotle and Scholasticism," in *A Companion to Peter Martyr Vermigli*, ed. W. J. Torrance Kirby, Emidio Campi, and Frank A. James, III (Leiden: Brill, 2009), 133-160.

The *Romans* lectures were presented between the years 1550 and 1552.²⁵³ It would be six years after their completion, in 1558, when the commentary was published. Unlike previous *loci* on justification, the polemic of this exposition manifests a serrated edge, the principle targets of which are Richard Smith, and, to an even greater extent, the Dutch Catholic theologian, Albert Pighius.²⁵⁴ Between these two interlocutors, Vermigli regards Pighius as far more serious.²⁵⁵ In fact, he calls him the "Achilles of the Papists."²⁵⁶

The other target of Vermigli's *locus* is the Council of Trent whose *Decree on Justification* had been released just five years earlier.²⁵⁷ According to Frank James, "The polemical tone in

²⁵³ According to Frank James, Vermigli lectured on *Romans* in at least three different locations (possibly four) during his career. The first conclusive account is from Girolamo Zanchi who noted that he heard Peter Martyr lecture on *Romans* in Lucca (1541-1542). A few years later, a Frenchman, Hubert de Bapasmé of Lille, revealed in a letter dated March 10, 1546 that Vermigli lectured on *Romans* in Strasbourg. Finally, there was Martyr's lecture as Regius professor of Divinity at Oxford (1550-1552). A possible fourth occasion was during Vermigli's triennium in Naples, about which McNair enumerates several reasons in support before ultimately calling the evidence inconclusive. Frank A. James, "Romans Commentary: Justification and Sanctification," 308.

²⁵⁴ Albertus Pighius, *Controversiarum praecipuarum in Comitiis Ratisponensibus ...tractarum et quibus nunc...exagitur Christi fides et religio religio, diligens, et luculenta explicatio* (Paris: Apud Viuantium Gaulterot, 1549). For more on Pighius see Hubert Jedin, *Studien über die schriftstellertätigkeit Albert Pigges*, Reformationsgeschichtliche Studien und Texte 55 (Münster: Aschendorff, 1931); Ludwig Pfeifer, *Ursprung der katholischen Kirche und Zugehörigkeit zur Kirche nach Albert Pigge* (Würzburg: Rita Verlag, 1938); Remigius Bäumer, "Albert Pigge," in *Katholische Theologen der Reformationszeit*, ed. Erwin Iserloh, Katholisches Leben und Kirchenreform im Zeitalter der Glaubensspaltung (Münster: Aschendorff, 1984); Remigius Bäumer, "Albert Pighius " in *Oxford Encyclopedia of the Reformation*, ed. Hans Hillerbrand, vol. 3 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1984), 271; Johann Feiner, *Die Erbsündenlehre Albert Pigges: ein Beitrag zur Erforschung der kath. Kontroverstheologie in der Reformationszeit*. Ph.D. thesis, Pontificia Universitas Gregoriana, 1940.

²⁵⁵ Marvin Anderson suggests that Vermigli's opposition to Pighius may have been motivated by the latter's polemic against Calvin, *Reformer in Exile*, 270. As a testimony to Pighius's reputation as a formidable theologian, Calvin wrote two works against him: Jean Calvin, *Defensio sanae et orthodoxae doctrinae de servitute et liberatione humani arbitrii adversus calumnias Alberti Pighii Campensis* (Geneva: Jean Crispin, 1543); Jean Calvin, *De aeterna Dei praedestinatione, qua in salutem alios ex hominibus elegit, alios suo exitio reliquit; item de providentia qua res humanas gubernat, Consensus pastorum Genevensis ecclesiae, a Io. Calvino expositus* (Geneva: Jean Crispin, 1552). This was in response to Albertus Pighius, *De libero hominis arbitrio & divina gratia, libri decem, nunc primum in lucem editi* (Cologne: Ex officina Melchioris Novensiani, 1542).

²⁵⁶ Vermigli, *Romanos*, 1231, 1264 [138, 172]. On page 1298 [204] he calls Pighius "Hercules."

²⁵⁷ The canons of Trent which anathematized Luther's doctrine of justification were issued in January 1547. The newest volume to date on Trent is by John W. O'Malley, *Trent: What Happened at the Council* (Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2013). Classic sources on Trent include *Concilium Tridentinum: Diariorum, actorum, epistularum, tractatum nova collectio*, 18 vols. (Fribourg: Societas Goerresiana, 1901-1985); Norman P. Tanner, ed. *Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils*, 2 vols. (London: MacMillan, 1990); Remigius Bäumer, ed. *Concilium Tridentinum*

the Romans commentary should be seen against the larger backdrop of the Council of Trent.”²⁵⁸ Indeed, the thrust of Peter Martyr’s *locus* is aimed at defending the doctrine of justification by faith alone (contra Trent); at the same time, there is an ethical orientation to his doctrine that clearly distinguishes it from the teaching of Luther. In this respect, Vermigli was very much like his colleague, Martin Bucer. The words of Bucer’s biographer, Martin Greschat, on this point may be equally applied to Vermigli: “If Luther emphasized the unsurpassed importance of the sinner’s justification by God, Bucer stressed the intimate connection between justification and the gift of an ethically renewed better life all the more.”²⁵⁹ How exactly Vermigli held these two forms of righteousness together in the name of justification will be the central question of our next chapter.

I. Conclusion

Looking at the big picture of Italian *Evangelisme*, a variety of notable characters cross the stage: aristocratic ladies such as Vittoria Colonna and Giulia Gonzaga, Spaniards such as Juan de Valdés, for a period of time at least Cardinals Contarini, Pietro Bembo, Reginald Pole, Giovanni Morone, Jacopo Sadoletto, and Girolamo Seripando, those who eventually fled such as Bernardino Ochino, Peter Martyr Vermigli, and Piero Paolo Vergerio, Girolamo Zanchi, and those who would become martyrs, namely Pietro Carnesecchi and Aonio Paleario.²⁶⁰ The beliefs and agendas of these characters often diverged;²⁶¹ nevertheless, there was a

(Darmstadt, 1979); Hubert Jedin, *Geschichte des Konzils von Trient*, 4 vols. (Freiburg, 1948-1975); H.J. Schroeder, ed. and trans. *The Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent* (Rockford, Illinois: Tan Books and Publishers, 1978).

²⁵⁸ James, "Romans Commentary," 309.

²⁵⁹ Martin Greschat, *Martin Bucer: A Reformer and His Times* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2004), 31. An important work for understanding Bucer’s doctrine of justification is W. P. Stephens, *The Holy Spirit in the Theology of Martin Bucer* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970). With regard to Bucer’s doctrine of “threefold justification,” see David C. Fink, “The Doers of the Law Will Be Justified: The Exegetical Origins of Martin Bucer’s *Triplex Iustificatio*,” *Journal of Theological Studies* 58 (2007), 485-524.

²⁶⁰ These names and others are found in Caponetto, *Protestant Reformation*; Firpo, “Italian Reformation,” 353-364; Grendler, “Religious Restlessness,” 27.

²⁶¹ Thus, Paul Grendler, quoting Delio Cantimori, notes the difficulty of distinguishing between *Evangelisme*’s “Catholic Reform, philo-Protestantism, or sympathy for Protestant ideas.” This was especially true in the years leading up to 1542. Delio Cantimori, *Prospettive di storia ereticale italiana del Cinquecento* (Bari: Editori Laterza, 1960), 28, 32-34 (in Grendler, “Religious Restlessness,” 25-38).

basic theological core drawing these figures together, the constituent elements of which would remain with Vermigli for the remainder of this life.

Peter Martyr brought his doctrine of two-fold righteousness with him to Strasbourg and eventually to Oxford, England. Amidst his many accomplishments during his six year tenure as Regius Professor of Divinity at Christ Church—e.g., the Eucharistic Disputation (1549), his contribution to the Second Book of Common Prayer (1552), and the Forty Two Articles of Religion (1553)—Vermigli’s lectures on Romans and subsequent commentary remain among his most significant theological achievements. The latter of his two *loci* from this volume, *de iustificatione*, represent his most mature thinking on the subject of justification and therefore constitute the focus of our study.

A summary of the doctrinal elements that we have considered in this chapter, for much of Italian *Evangelisme* and for Peter Martyr, would have *sola fide* at the center, based upon a canonically informed exegesis of Scripture, issuing forth in a life so closely identified with Christ that it enjoys the benefits of a forensic imputation and the Holy Spirit who transforms the believer from within. Exactly how Vermigli develops this *duplex iustitia* and distinguishes it from the teaching of his Catholic interlocutors will be the subject of our next chapter; but, in closing, we wish to let Vermigli speak to the matter for himself. In his final moments of life, according to Simler, “[Peter Martyr] was silent in deep personal reflection; then he turned to us and stated with a rather clear voice that he acknowledged life and salvation in Christ alone, who had been given by the Father to the human race as its only savior.”²⁶² This catch phrase, “salvation in Christ alone,” is an apt summary of Vermigli’s doctrine of justification, a doctrine that was so deeply ingrained in his Italian background that it found clear expression in his dying words.

²⁶² Vermigli, *Life, Letters, and Sermons*, 60.

Chapter Two

Peter Martyr Vermigli's Doctrine of Justification

A. Theological Contours of Vermigli's Doctrine of Justification

Having considered the historical background to Vermigli's doctrine of justification, we will now evaluate its theological content. The primary source for our study (among Martyr's other works) is his *Justification Locus* from his *Romans* commentary, which appears at the conclusion of the eleventh chapter.²⁶³ Over against the Roman position (as represented by Vermigli's interlocutors), Martyr presents a classic Protestant doctrine which defines the formal cause of justification in the strict sense of a legal pronouncement grounded in the imputation of Christ's righteousness.²⁶⁴ In making this case, Vermigli employs forensic terminology to underscore that the basis of justification belongs to the legal domain.²⁶⁵ At the same time, he uses the language of justification to describe the renewal of sinners by the Holy Spirit which results in a disposition (*habitus*) of righteousness.²⁶⁶ In defending his position, Martyr's *Romans locus* on justification unfolds three propositions: (1.) Justification is not by works, (2.) It is by faith, (3.) It is by faith alone.²⁶⁷

Vermigli's doctrine posits forensic "justification" as a punctiliar event—an act in which God declares a sinner to be righteous. He also uses the language of justification to describe an ongoing process of sanctification. It must be noted, however, that this secondary sense is properly distinguished from the forensic use of the word, which is

²⁶³ Pietro Martire Vermigli, *In epistolam S. Pauli apostoli ad Romanos...* (Basel: Apud Petrum Perna, 1560), 1181-1324 (1182). The first edition was published in 1558. All references to Vermigli's *Romans* commentary will cite page numbers from his 1560 version (which is available on the *Digital Library of Classic Protestant Texts*) followed in brackets by pages from Frank James's English translation: Peter Martyr Vermigli, *Predestination and Justification: Two Theological Loci*, trans. and ed. Frank A. James, III, *The Peter Martyr Library* 8 (Kirkville, MO: Truman State University Press, 2003), 87-230 [87].

²⁶⁴ Vermigli does not use the language of "*iustitia aliena*" but he affirms the concept when he asserts that justification is grounded in the judicial transference of Christ's righteousness to the sinner. *Rom*, 1182 [87]; 1201 [107]; 1314 [220].

²⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, 1182 [87-88]. ". . . verba est forense, quod ad iudicia spectat. . ."

²⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, 1182 [87].

²⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, 1181-1253 [87-160]; 1253-1311 [160-218]; 1312-1324 [218-230].

primary. With both of these in view, justification involves a two-fold righteousness which is forensic and also moral.²⁶⁸ With regard to the former, Martyr speaks in eschatological terms, explaining how God's end-time judgment is currently rendered in the lives of his children.²⁶⁹ The basis of this declaration is solely the imputation of Christ's righteousness.²⁷⁰ Regarding the latter, there is an ongoing need for the moral chaos of sin to be reformed in sanctification.²⁷¹ For Vermigli, it is not sufficient to simply speak of forensic justification without also connecting it to the Holy Spirit's work of renewal. He thus recognizes "two meanings of the phrase 'to justify,' namely, in fact or in judgment or estimation."²⁷²

In reading Martyr's *Romans locus*, it is not long before one recognizes a confrontation with what he regards as "Pelagianism" in the Roman Church.²⁷³ Donnelly takes issue with this critique and suggests that Martyr's portrait of Trent creates a "straw man."²⁷⁴ As Frank James points out, however, "For an Augustinian like Vermigli, whose most basic theological presupposition was that all humanity after Adam's fall is *massa perditionis* (a mass of perdition), Pelagianism was intolerable."²⁷⁵ Furthermore, for Vermigli, the "Pelagian" problem also posed a pastoral threat:

Certainly no one understands except those who have experienced how difficult it is for a bruised heart, dejected and weary with the burden of sins to find comfort. . . . If we, like the Sophists, commanded a person to have regard for his own works, then

²⁶⁸ One way in which Vermigli captures the legal and relational dimensions of justification is by describing divine acceptance in terms of "adoption." Ibid., 1232 [139], 1259 [167], 1280 [187].

²⁶⁹ Ibid., 1263 [171].

²⁷⁰ Ibid., 1194 [100].

²⁷¹ An explanation of this emphasis is found below in section B., "Regeneration and Pneumatic Renewal."

²⁷² Ibid., 1182 [88]. The latter of these, justification "in judgment," constitutes the formal cause. Immediately after making this statement, Vermigli explains why the renewal of the Spirit and "way of life acquired from good works" ultimately relies upon forensic imputation to accomplish one's justification, since such works remain "imperfect and incomplete."

²⁷³ After quoting the Council of Trent, Vermigli quips, "What else would Pelagius say if he were now alive?" Ibid., 1248-49 [156]. A more accurate reading of Trent, however, would recognize its gracious character. Chapter eight of the Council's *Decree on Justification* explicitly states that justification comes as a "free gift," and does so on the perennial consent of the Catholic Church, on the basis of faith, "without which 'it is impossible to please God'" (Heb 11:6). *Decree on Justification*, ch. 8 in N.P. Tanner, *Decrees*, 2:674.

²⁷⁴ John Patrick Donnelly, *Calvinism and Scholasticism in Vermigli's Doctrine of Man and Grace*, Studies in Medieval and Reformation Thought 18 (Leiden: Brill, 1976), 151.

²⁷⁵ Frank James III, introduction to *Predestination and Justification*, xxxv.

he would never find comfort, would always be tormented, always in doubt of his salvation and finally, be swallowed up with desperation.²⁷⁶

It is not necessary to repeat here what others have elsewhere so carefully treated. Frank James III, in his doctoral dissertation, *De Iustificazione: The Evolution of Peter Martyr Vermigli's Doctrine of Justification*, traces the main lines of Martyr's doctrine through the development of his Protestant career.²⁷⁷ He analyses Vermigli's three primary writings on the subject—*loci* on justification from his commentaries on *Genesis* (1542-47), *1 Corinthians* (1548-49), and *Romans* (1550-52),²⁷⁸ showing how his doctrine underwent a maturation process. James reveals how Vermigli covered essentially the same theological ground in each *locus*, with successive editions providing further detail and support.²⁷⁹ None of these developments, however, changed the essence of Vermigli's position.

Vermigli's doctrine draws deeply from the well of Scripture. In keeping with the *sola scriptura* principle of Protestantism, he appeals to the Bible as his final authority.²⁸⁰ Support from the church fathers and councils only carry weight insofar as they accord with Scripture. Speaking of the councils, for instance, he writes, "[T]hey should not be heard without selectivity and judgment. We ought to receive and reverence only those councils which have kept their doctrine within the rule of Holy Scriptures."²⁸¹ The council that occupies the lion's share of Vermigli's attention is the Council of Trent (1545-63). What begins on an irenic note immediately changes to a sharp critique: "There those good holy fathers, that is,

²⁷⁶ Vermigli, *Romanos*, 1208 [114].

²⁷⁷ Frank A. James, III, "*De Iustificazione: The Evolution of Peter Martyr Vermigli's Doctrine of Justification*" (PhD diss., Westminster Theological Seminary, 2000).

²⁷⁸ These dates indicate the years when Vermigli lectured on these books. Initial publication occurred according to the following: *Genesis* (in Zurich by Christoph Froschauer, 1569), *1 Corinthians* (in Zurich by Christoph Froschauer, 1551), *Romans* (in London by John Daye, 1558).

²⁷⁹ Given the polemical setting in which Martyr wrote his *Romans locus*, the text displays a higher number of biblical citations. He also gives considerable attention to the church fathers, whereas previous *loci* only gave them an occasional reference.

²⁸⁰ Vermigli, *Romanos*, 1245 [152]. This is illustrated by the meticulous attention that Vermigli devotes to Hebrew, Greek, and Latin exegesis (1182-1185 [87-91]), and also the profusion of biblical texts that he marshals throughout his commentary. Joseph C. McLelland puts an edge on this point when he writes, "Peter Martyr's quarrel with Rome may be summed up in the phrase, 'the Scriptures, and not the traditions of men.'" Joseph C. McLelland, *The Visible Words of God: An Exposition of the Sacramental Theology of Peter Martyr Vermigli, A.D. 1500-1562* (Edinburgh: Oliver & Boyd, 1957), 125.

²⁸¹ Ibid.

hirelings of the pope. . . .”²⁸² The polemic that follows unleashes an array of arguments around five basic topics: the priority of grace over works,²⁸³ the efficacious nature of the Spirit’s renewal of the heart,²⁸⁴ opposition of a general grace which is supposedly accessible to all,²⁸⁵ the causes of justification,²⁸⁶ and the certainty of God to deliver on his promises, that is, the doctrine of assurance.²⁸⁷ The aggregate of these critiques amounts to Martyr’s overall argument against the notion that one “can merit and prepare for justification.”²⁸⁸ The following analysis will consider how these elements fit together.

B. Regeneration and Pneumatic Renewal

As already indicated, Vermigli was concerned to include the cultivation of virtue in his doctrine of justification, even as he clarified and contended for its forensic character. It is noteworthy that at the very beginning of his *locus*, where he unpacks the meaning of the Hebrew verb *tsadac*, he starts by explaining how God endows believers “with his own Spirit and renews them fully by restoring the strength of their minds. . . .”²⁸⁹ Such sensitivity to the Spirit’s renewing work is fundamental to Vermigli’s doctrine, as evidenced in his description of justification as “the summit of all *piety*,”²⁹⁰ a work of God which necessarily leads the regenerate into an experience of godliness.

Unlike the Catholic understanding which ultimately grounds justification in *gratia inhaerens*, Vermigli insists that justification is properly rooted in a forensic imputation of righteousness which is *extra nos*. At the same time, his doctrine of justification also includes the Spirit’s work of internal renewal. Vermigli maintained that this forensic doctrine exists in a

²⁸² Ibid., 1249 [156].

²⁸³ Ibid.

²⁸⁴ Ibid., 1249-50 [157].

²⁸⁵ Ibid., 1216-1217 [123-124].

²⁸⁶ Ibid., 1251-1252 [159].

²⁸⁷ Ibid., 1252-1253 [159-160].

²⁸⁸ Ibid., 1252 [159].

²⁸⁹ Ibid., 1182 [87].

²⁹⁰ Emphasis added, Ibid., 1191 [96]. *columen totius pietatis*. Calvin uses similar language to describe justification: “*quae pietatis est totius summa*” in Calvin, *Institutes* 3:15:7. Petrus Barth & Guilelmus Niesel (eds.) *Johannis Calvini Opera Selecta* 4:245 (Munich: Chr. Kaiser, 1958: Second Edition).

three-fold (*tres partes*) concept of justification, a position that he maintains in his *Genesis*²⁹¹ and *1 Corinthians*²⁹² commentaries' *loci* on justification.²⁹³ The constituent elements of this conception—(forensic) justification, regeneration, and sanctification—could be distinguished, but never separated.²⁹⁴

While Peter Martyr does not reiterate the same three-fold scheme in his *Romans locus*, he does so in his *Romans* commentary where he reflects on the doctrine of justification. His statement of the three aspects of righteousness mirror his *Genesis* and *1 Corinthians loci* on justification in which righteousness not only consists in the forgiveness of sins; it also includes the presence of the Holy Spirit which renews the mind and disposition (regeneration) and issues forth in a habit of virtue (sanctification). For example, in his commentary on *Romans* 1:17, he writes:

God declares his righteousness or goodness toward us by three things chiefly. First, he receives us into favor, forgiving us our sins: not imputing death to us for those sins we commit, but on the contrary, imputes to us instead the obedience and holiness of Christ. Second, he kindles in our heart a desire to live uprightly, he renews our will, illuminates our reason and makes us prone to live virtuously, although before we abhorred that which was just and honest. Third, he gives us pure and chaste conduct, good actions and a sincere life.²⁹⁵

²⁹¹ Speaking of justification, Vermigli writes that it is “iustitia nobis collata à Deo, tres habet partes.” *Mosis commentarii*, 59.

²⁹² “Sed iustitia Dei, quando nobis ab eo confertur, tripartita est.” Pietro Martire Vermigli, *In Selectissimam D. Pauli Apostoli Priorem Ad Corinthios Epistolam Commentarii* (Zurich: Christophorus Froschouerus, 1579), 15. For an English translation, see Peter Martyr Vermigli, *PMR*, 135.

²⁹³ Vermigli's *triplex iustificatio* differs from that of Martin Bucer, which consists, firstly, of divine election, secondly, with the remission of sins mediated by the Spirit and accessed by faith alone, and, third, by monergistic works in Christ which God enables one to perform. Martin Bucer, *Metaphrasis et Enarratio in Epistolam D. Pauli Apostoli ad Romanos* (Basel, 1562): 119.

²⁹⁴ Prior to his *Romans locus*, Vermigli employed the language of “impartation” with regard to the transference of forensic and actual righteousness. For instance, his *1 Corinthians Locus* says that God justifies us “by compassionately imparting (*impartiendō*) his mercy and promises.” “Primum sane constituatur, deum esse qui nos iustificat, suam misericordiam et promissiones clementer impartiendo.” Vermigli, *Corinthios Commentarii*, 18. For an English translation, see Vermigli, *PMR*, 143. By the time Martyr lectures from *Romans*, however, he discontinues the language of “impartation.” Frank James suggests that Vermigli's work in England, which sought to achieve greater continuity with the Continent, likely motivated this revision. James, “*De Iustificatione*,” 301.

²⁹⁵ “Declarat autem Deus hanc suam iustitiam, sive bonitatem erga nos tribus potissimum rebus. Primum nos recipit in gratiam, condonat peccata, non imputat ea, quae nos [note] admittimus, ad mortem: sed e diverso potius imputat Christi obedientiam & sanctitatem. Secundo accendit in animis nostris studium recte vivendi, instaurat voluntatem, illustrat rationem, nosque totos propensos facit ad recte vivendum, quum antea a iusto honestoque abhorreremus. Tertio loco donat puros & castos mores, probas actiones, & synceram vitam.” Vermigli, *Romanos*, 50.

Martyr also explicates Romans 3:21 according to this three-fold structure:

The righteousness of God, as I have declared in other places, is threefold: the first is that we are received into favor through Christ, and our sins forgiven and the righteousness of Christ is imputed to us. The second righteousness follows this, namely that through the help of the Holy Spirit, our mind is reformed and we are inwardly renewed by grace. Third, holy and godly works follow.²⁹⁶

In this scheme, Martyr places regeneration and sanctification side by side in the name of justification as gifts which the Holy Spirit imparts to the elect, while clearly and emphatically reserving the place of priority for imputation.²⁹⁷ As far as we can tell, this attentiveness to the Spirit's work of renewal had been part of Martyr's theological framework for nearly a decade by the time he lectured on *Romans* at Oxford in 1551-52. Reaching back to his first published work, his exposition on the Apostles' Creed (1544),²⁹⁸ he similarly emphasized the indwelling of the Spirit in generating the outward evidence of righteousness by which one is in some sense judged and rewarded on the last day: "From this [divine inheritance]" he writes, "we learn that our salvation does not depend on us, but on that divine election by which grace, the Spirit and faith dwell within us."²⁹⁹ Indeed, Martyr goes so far as to assert:

This is the very essence [*tutto il negozio*] of Christianity: to be ever renewed within, and do good to those around us as much as possible. The risen Christ did not cease to bring blessing to others, but poured out upon his own the most precious gift of the Spirit.³⁰⁰

²⁹⁶ "Iustitia Dei, ut alias docui, triplex est. Prima, qua per Christum in gratiam recipimur, & condonantur peccata, & Christi iustitia nobis imputatur. Ad hanc altera consequitur, ut vi Spiritus sancti reformetur animus noster, totique intus per gratiam instauremur. Tertio consequuntur sanctae & piaae exercitationes. nam, qui huc pervenerunt, magno studio flagrant bene operandi." Ibid., 179.

²⁹⁷ So, for instance, after unpacking the *tres partes* of righteousness from *Romans* 1:17, Martyr writes: Sed primum horum trium, & capitale, & summum est, quod alia complectitur, & dicitur esse Dei iustitia, quae in nos ab illo provenit. Non enim viribus humanis eam acquirimus. Ibid., 50.

²⁹⁸ Martyr's work, *Una Semplice Dichiaratione sopra gli XII Articola della Fede Christiana* (Basel: John Hervagrus, 1544) surveys Christian doctrine from the viewpoint of the Protestantism, which he had recently embraced.

²⁹⁹ Peter Martyr Vermigli, *Early Writings: Creed, Scripture, Church*, trans. and ed. Mariano Di Gangi and Joseph C. McLelland, *The Peter Martyr Library* 1 (Kirkville, MO: Thomas Jefferson University Press, 1994), 53.

³⁰⁰ Ibid., 49.

While such an emphasis upon the internal renewal of the Spirit would have been rather natural for Vermigli in the year or two following his departure from Italy, owing to his rigorous training in Catholicism, it is remarkable to observe how this emphasis continued into the latter stages of his life when he was a Protestant leader. We see, for instance, in his *1 Corinthians locus, On Justification*, a book on which he lectured in 1548 shortly after having been appointed Regius professor of theology at Oxford (it was published in 1551), Martyr's concern to include good works in his doctrine of justification:

A different kind of justification follows this upright life of holiness by which we are clearly praised, approved or declared just. For although good works do not bring that first righteousness which is given freely, yet they point to it and show it is present.... And on this same basis we will be justified by Christ in the last judgment by the remembrance of good works, that is, we will be declared just, on the testimony of mercy shown to our neighbors.³⁰¹

Martyr explains that such good works are buttressed by the imputation of Christ's righteousness, which restores what is lacking in our "weak and mutilated" works,³⁰² thus comforting the human soul and assuaging our existential pangs of guilt. In this way, one's upright life of holiness functions as the basis of future justification. Such holiness, in effect, is the vindication of one's justification.

While Vermigli maintains his three-fold understanding of justification in his *Romans* commentary, it is noteworthy that he doesn't explicate the same formulation in his *Romans locus* on justification.³⁰³ Here, he no longer places regeneration and sanctification under the rubric of justification. In a strict sense "justification" is limited to a forensic activity; yet, at the same time, Vermigli understands regeneration and sanctification to necessarily accompany forensic imputation. Interpreting the *Romans locus* on justification in the larger context of the *Romans* commentary reveals the two distinct levels of justification alluded to above. Frank James helpfully summarizes:

³⁰¹ "Ad hanc rectam vitam sanctorum, consequitur quaedam alia species iustificationis, qua scilicet laudamur, approbamus, & iusti praedicamur. Nam bona opera licet illam primam iustitiam quae gratis conceditur non afferant, attamen indicant, & illam adesse demonstrant.... Et hac eadem ratione à Christo in extremo iudicio commemoratione bonorum operum iustificabimur, id est iusti declarabimur, ex testimonio misericordiae proximis exhibitae." Vermigli, *Corinthios Commentarii*, 19. For an English translation, see Vermigli, *PMR*, 147. cf. *Romanos*, 1182 [88].

³⁰² Vermigli, *PMR*, 147.

³⁰³ Frank James suggests the reason why Vermigli uses the *tres partes* concept of justification in his commentary and not in his *locus* is probably based on later reflection from Zurich when he made final revisions before publication in 1558. James, "De Iustificatione," 330.

In sum, Vermigli embraces both a narrower and stricter forensic understanding of justification, as well as a broader moral understanding, which stresses the necessary relationship between forensic justification and its accompanying benefits of regeneration and sanctification. Forensic justification, which is based on the imputed righteousness of Christ alone, is necessarily accompanied by the regenerative work of the Holy Spirit, which produces a moral transformation in the sinner, which in turn inevitably produces sanctification and good works.³⁰⁴

Because Vermigli is particularly concerned with how justification leads to the development of tangible faith,³⁰⁵ he posits “two inward movements” of the Holy Spirit in which God exerts influence upon one’s mind and volition.³⁰⁶ From this double movement, faith is “engendered.”³⁰⁷ Vermigli also conveys this idea—that God forgives those whom he has already enlivened—in his exposition of Romans 8:1-2 where he states that “after the spirit will have first moved the hearts of those listening, so that they believe, then at last the Gospel obtains/shows its power to save (for saving).”³⁰⁸ For this reason, Martyr describes the Holy Spirit as the “cause” of faith.³⁰⁹ Following naturally from his deeply held Augustinian conviction that humanity is a *massa perditionis*,³¹⁰ Vermigli asserts that “Unless [one’s heart] has been renewed by the Spirit,” there can be no justifying faith.³¹¹ The Spirit enlivenes, which produces faith,³¹² resulting in justification. Vermigli envisages such faith as growing out of

³⁰⁴ Frank A. James, “Romans Commentary: Justification and Sanctification,” in *A Companion to Peter Martyr Vermigli*, ed. W. J. Torrance Kirby, Emidio Campi, and Frank A. James, III (Leiden: Brill, 2009), 314.

³⁰⁵ *Ibid.*, 1182 [87], 1215-16 [122].

³⁰⁶ *Ibid.*, 1249-50 [156-157]: “In iustificatione duos esse interiores motus: quorum alter ad rationem pertineat, quae, uti diximus, non tantum docenda sit, sed etiam persuadenda, traducendaque in sententiam spiritus sancti. Alteri autem ad voluntatem, ut illa flectatur ad ea omnia suscipienda quae spiritus sanctus promittit et offert. Ea est fides, qua iustificamur, et per quam peccata nobis nostra condonantur.”

³⁰⁷ *Ibid.*, 1284 [191].

³⁰⁸ “At postquam spiritus corda audientium semel permoverit, ut credant, tum demum Evangelium vim suam ad servandum obtinet” (*Romanos*, 609)

³⁰⁹ *Ibid.*, 1284 [191]: “quoniam causa est fidei.”

³¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 1196 [102].

³¹¹ *Ibid.*, 1249 [157]: “Sed animus humanus nisi innovetur spiritu.”

³¹² Martyr employs various phrases to describe this enlivening work: “God renews the heart of man,” “the illumination of the Holy Spirit,” “inspiration,” and the activity of being “called and stirred by grace.” *Ibid.*

the Spirit's initial work, resulting in a union with Christ.³¹³ He writes, "But now, delivered by the grace of God, we are joined with Christ by the Spirit, to Christ himself being raised from the dead. By this union we may bring forth fruit to God, and no more death and damnation."³¹⁴ Vermigli does not develop the concept of union with Christ in explicit terms outside of this reference.

The necessity of the Spirit's enlivening work in Vermigli's doctrine can scarcely be overstated: "Those who are justified receive the Holy Spirit, for without him it is quite impossible to be justified."³¹⁵ After the Spirit produces faith, it is this faith that constitutes the direct link to justification. So Martyr asserts: "as soon as one believes, he is immediately justified."³¹⁶ In making this connection, Vermigli is not positing faith as the formal causes of justification; he is, rather, concerned to show the logical progression in which the enlivening work of the Spirit leads to faith which leads to justification and sanctification. In this sequence, faith functions as the *causa instrumentum* by which God's people apprehend forgiveness and new life,³¹⁷ a faith that is generated by the Holy Spirit.³¹⁸

In addition to producing faith, the work of the Holy Spirit also stimulates sanctification.³¹⁹ Accordingly, Vermigli applies the term "righteousness" in two distinct ways. When addressing the strict sense of justification, the word describes the forensic accrediting which results in one being regarded as righteous. This sense is the burden of Vermigli's *Romans locus*. At the same time, he also uses the word to describe the cultivation of righteousness in the believer's soul,³²⁰ beginning with one's conversion and leading to "good

³¹³ Vermigli's understanding resembles that of John Calvin, *Institutes*, 3.16.1.

³¹⁴ Vermigli, *Romanos*, 1196-1197 [102]: "Sed iam nunc liberati Dei gratia, Christo per spiritum copulamur, Christo, inquam, excitato a mortuis, ex qua coniunctione iam Deo fructificabimus non amplius morti et damnationi."

³¹⁵ Ibid., 1201 [107]: "Qui iustificantur, spiritum sanctum accipiunt, nam iustificari absque illo prorsus est impossibile."

³¹⁶ Ibid., 1305 [210]: "Quam primum inquit homo credit, confestim, inquit iustificatus est." Cf. 1233 [139-140].

³¹⁷ Vermigli, *Romanos*, 1260-61 [168]; 1290 [197]; 1320 [226].

³¹⁸ Ibid., 1282 [190]: "Praeterea rixatur etiam de productione fidei, quaeritque, unde ea in nobis generetur. Nos uno verbo facile respondemus a Spiritu sancto."

³¹⁹ Ibid., 1272-73 [180-181].

³²⁰ Ibid., 1182 [87].

and holy works,” that is, sanctification.³²¹ Unlike the forensic declaration of righteousness, this tangible manifestation of righteousness is *not* accessed by faith alone, but rather through spiritual discipline.³²² Thus, Martyr draws a connection between the regenerating work of the Spirit and sanctification: “there is no fruit of sanctification except what follows regeneration.”³²³

As we will discover in due course, comparison with Newman is interesting here. While Newman emphatically repudiates the Catholic notion of *habitus* (in favor of Divine Indwelling), Vermigli is quite comfortable with the idea of the progressive development of holiness, that is, a “habit” of righteousness in the context of sanctification. Precisely because regenerate ones are having their minds and wills renovated by the renewing work of the Holy Spirit, they “cooperate with the power of God.”³²⁴ Such cooperation grows in time and actually becomes a form of *iustitia inhaerente* which leads to further acts of piety.³²⁵ This, in Vermigli’s words, is the “inward righteousness which is rooted in us, which we obtain and confirm by leading a continually upright life.”³²⁶

The other element of Vermigli’s doctrine that might be mentioned with reference to the work of the Holy Spirit is the role of heavenly rewards for the one whose life produces good works—that is, providing that such works are not understood as a debt owed.³²⁷ In his commentary on *First Corinthians*, Vermigli underscores that one’s good works, emerging from one’s habit of righteousness, are accepted by God:

In the third place [in the *tres partes* concept of justification], from the habit of good works a certain righteousness adheres [*inhaerens*] to our souls, whereby we can also be called righteous in our human conduct. Neither the things we do nor the righteousness

³²¹ Ibid., 1305-1306 [211]: “Postquam autem semel sumus iustificati, non satis est ad obtinendam salutem dicere, Credo: Accedat etiam oportet sancta vita, et bona opera. . .”

³²² Ibid., 1318 [224]: “[W]e grant that Christ requires more of us than faith, for who doubts that he wants those who are justified to live uprightly and to practice virtue of all kinds.”

³²³ Ibid., 1196 [102]: “Fructus autem sanctificatio nisi ibi est nullus, verum ipsam regenerationem sequitur.”

³²⁴ Ibid., 1250 [158]: “et gratia, atque spiritu instauratus cum divina virtute una cooperatur.”

³²⁵ Vermigli quotes Augustine with approval with regard to “the righteousness that adheres in us.” (Augustinum sensisse de iustitia inhaerente) Ibid., 1320 [226].

³²⁶ Ibid., 1299 [205]: “. . .sed de illa intrinseca nobis inhaerente, quam recte vivendo perpetuo acquirimus, et confirmamus.”

³²⁷ Ibid., 1194 [100].

thus acquired are rejected by God, since they come from a soul which is already regenerate.³²⁸

Such moral achievement results in rewards, which come to the faithful as a divine gift. According to Vermigli, “. . . we will grant that God sets forth prizes and rewards whereby we are moved to live holy lives.”³²⁹ He is careful to indicate that this accomplishment leaves no room whatsoever for boasting.³³⁰ Nevertheless, good works are expected to characterize one who has been justified, precisely because of the Spirit’s activity of regeneration.³³¹ While Martyr states at the outset of his *Romans locus* that it is not his purpose to develop the subject of works which follow justification,³³² he asserts that “such works are profitable to the regenerate, for by living uprightly and orderly they are renewed and made perfect.”³³³ Quoting Augustine, Martyr states that in this way (by producing virtuous works) justified ones fulfill the law by the grace of the Gospel.³³⁴ Thus, in good Augustinian fashion, Vermigli safeguards the comprehensive nature of divine grace, while simultaneously promoting the cultivation of virtue. Both are made possible by a union with God “by the Spirit.”³³⁵ A summary statement of this relationship is found in the following:

Since no one has fulfilled or can fulfill it [the command to love God with heart, soul, and strength], it follows that we should fly to Christ through whom we may be justified by faith. After being justified, we may in some way begin to do what is commanded, albeit imperfectly.³³⁶

³²⁸ Vermigli, *Corinthios Commentarii*, 136.

³²⁹ Vermigli, *Romanos*, 1288 [195].

³³⁰ *Ibid.*, 1289 [195]: After arguing thus, he concludes, “Therefore, we must take away all merit, not only in those who are not yet justified, but also in those who have been justified.”

³³¹ One way to see this emphasis on renewal and works in Vermigli is in his treatment of James 2:17-16. There are three such places in his *Romans locus*. In these comments he asserts that faith works (1187 [93]), it is accepted by God (1239-1240 [146]), and by works one comes to a fuller knowledge of God (1311 [217]).

³³² *Ibid.*, 1189-1190 [995].

³³³ *Ibid.*, 1290 [196].

³³⁴ *Ibid.*, 1239 [146]. Martyr quotes Augustine’s work, *Against Julian*, book four, chapter three.

³³⁵ *Ibid.*, 1196-1197 [102].

³³⁶ *Ibid.*, 1233 [139]: “... quod quia nunquam quisquam aut praestiterit, aut praestare potest, nihil superest, nisi ut confugiamus ad Christum a quo per fidem iustificemur, deinde iustificari, id quod praecipitur, incipiamus ut cunque efficere.”

The first part of this equation—flying to Christ to be justified by faith—is the subject to which will now turn our attention.

C. The Forensic Framework of Justification

Forensic justification is crucial to Vermigli's doctrine. In the very first paragraph of his *locus* (before his Hebrew lexicography and discussion on the role of the Holy Spirit), he raises a question that indicates the trajectory of what will follow: "Are men justified by works or by faith?"³³⁷ The binary nature of this question, as we shall see, is significant for the conclusion that Martyr will eventually reach:

Since there are two meanings of "to justify," namely, in fact or in judgment or estimation, and since the same God is author of both, which of the two should we follow in the proposed discussion? The latter, in fact, because the renewal imputed by the Spirit of God and our righteousness, that is, the way of life acquired by good works, are still imperfect and incomplete. . . . Besides that, when debating the matter, Paul was influenced by the testimony of the history of Abraham in Genesis and by the authority of David; he used the verb "to be reckoned," and, with proper understanding, reasons in light of our present concern and question.³³⁸

Vermigli thus concludes the prolegomena of his *locus* by choosing imputation over spiritual renewal as the primary and fundamental ground of justification. In addition to providing readers with a synopsis of his position, the above also reveals the fundamental presupposition that undergirds his doctrine of justification: the sinfulness of humanity.³³⁹ For instance, as an example of how the problem of sin impacts humanity, Martyr points to the transgression of Adam in *Romans* 5 where one observes "the cause of so great an evil."³⁴⁰ Following from the first man's disobedience, humanity is "lost and condemned," which includes infants.³⁴¹ Later in his *locus*, Vermigli asserts this point rather explicitly, "The works

³³⁷ Ibid., 1181 [87]: "Iustificentur ne homines operibus, ab fide."

³³⁸ Ibid., 1182 [88].

³³⁹ As mentioned, Martyr doesn't hesitate using Augustine's phrase *massa perditionis* to describe this plight. Ibid., 1196 [102]: "Omnes nascentes massa perditionis complectitur, a qua labe homines operibus suis emergere posse, et vindicare sibi iustificationem iuxta sacras literas fieri non potest."

³⁴⁰ Ibid., 1196 [101]: "Accedit adhaec, quòd tanti mali causa exprimitur."

³⁴¹ Ibid., 1196 [102]: "iam inde à prima ipsa origine per primum hominem perdit sumus & damnati."

of unregenerate men are sins.”³⁴² In other words, the unregenerate are incapable of producing works that are acceptable to God. Therefore, the basis of justification cannot possibly rest on human effort. Such logic is particularly clear where Martyr comments on *Romans* 10:3:

Being ignorant of the righteousness that comes from God, and seeking to establish their own righteousness, they did not submit to the righteousness of God.” These words mean nothing else but that those who attribute too much to their own righteousness, namely to works, depart from God’s righteousness. So great is the contrast between grace and works that the effect that proceeds from the one cannot proceed from the other.³⁴³

The above line of reasoning, with its binary contrast between grace and works, is predicated on Vermigli’s anthropology, a view that Frank James has labeled “intensive Augustinianism.”³⁴⁴ According to James, “It is [Martyr’s] profound conviction that the Adamic fall rendered all of humanity legally guilty before the divine judge and morally corrupt in their souls, thus bringing alienation and condemnation from God.”³⁴⁵ This conviction, perhaps more than any other, appears to be the driving force behind Vermigli’s vehement opposition of what he perceives as the “Pelagianism” of his interlocutors.³⁴⁶

A clear focus on the problem of human guilt inherited from Adam, in turn, eventually leads Vermigli to affirm the concept of imputation (*imputatio*), which he understands as a judicial transference of righteousness to the sinner.³⁴⁷ Simply put, God “confers” the righteousness of Christ upon one so that he is considered or reckoned to be righteous *coram deo*.³⁴⁸ Vermigli stresses that this only happens by divine initiative. Commenting on *Romans* 4: 1-4, Martyr explains how the concept of “imputation” is owing entirely to grace and effectively undermines what he regards as the notion of merit: “[Paul postulates imputation] as an

³⁴² Ibid., 1301 [201]: “... opera hominum non renatorum esse peccata.”

³⁴³ Ibid., 1199 [105].

³⁴⁴ Frank A. James, III, “The Complex of Justification: Peter Martyr Vermigli Versus Albert Pighius,” in *Peter Martyr Vermigli: Humanism, Republicanism, Reformation*, ed. Emidio Campi, Frank A. James, III, and Peter Opitz (Geneva: Librairie Droz, 2002), 52-53.

³⁴⁵ Ibid.

³⁴⁶ With regard to Trent, Vermigli, *Romanos*, 1248-49 [156]; Pighius, 1282-1283 [190]; Smith, 1323 [229].

³⁴⁷ Ibid., 1182 [87]: “Interdum vero iustificat Deus absolvendo a peccatis, adscribendo et imputando iustitiam.”

³⁴⁸ Ibid., 1201 [107]; 1314 [220].

antithesis to merit or debt, so that he to whom something is imputed neither deserves it nor receives it as debt.”³⁴⁹ Furthermore, this imputation is two-fold in the sense that the sinner receives the attribution of Christ’s righteousness and also the non-imputation of his own sins.³⁵⁰ Martyr recognizes such imputation as essential to a biblical understanding of justification.

For Vermigli, imputation is *extra nos* in that it addresses one’s legal status, and not a form of *iustitia in nobis*, which affects the soul. Contrary to medieval Catholic theology, Martyr asserts that justifying righteousness, “does not adhere [*inhaere*] to our souls, but is imputed by God.”³⁵¹ Moreover, Martyr also articulates a reverse imputation in which the sinner’s guilt is put upon Christ. Writing about the suffering servant of Isaiah 53, Martyr elucidates this point, “[Christ] also in a sense justifies those that he takes on himself and bears their iniquities.”³⁵²

In his analysis of the diachronic development of Vermigli’s doctrine of justification, Frank James points out that in his *Romans locus* Vermigli specifically employs the term *forense* for the first time (even though the concept had appeared in previous *loci*).³⁵³ James suggests that such terminology was probably invoked to draw more explicit continuity with the teaching of the continental Reformers.³⁵⁴ This conceptual development is related to an even more novel feature of Martyr’s work in *Romans*: the postulation of an inaugurated eschatology. In this way, Vermigli describes the virtuous works of the regenerate as demonstrating their “participation in eternal life”³⁵⁵ and justification as “eternal life already begun in us *now*.”³⁵⁶ Accordingly, one’s identification with Christ—resulting in two-fold imputation (Christ takes the

³⁴⁹ Ibid., 1194 [100]: “... nos ex operibus non iustificari. Quoque id magis persuaderet, verbum id logizein, quod dicimus imputare, adscribere alicui iustitiam, aut pro iusto aliquem habere urget, et vult habere antithesim ad meritum et debitum, ita ut is cui quippiam imputatur, id non mereatur, neque ut debitum accipiat.”

³⁵⁰ Martyr makes this point by quoting *Romans* 4:5 and *Genesis* 15:6 to assert that God simultaneously forgives sins and credits those who believe with righteousness. Ibid., 1252 [159].

³⁵¹ Ibid., 1194 [100]: “Quibus ex verbis non solum ellicimus iustitiam, qua dicimus iustificari, non inhaere animis nostris, sed imputari a Deo...”

³⁵² Ibid., 1264 [172]: “atque ita, ut ipse in se suscipiat, et portet illorum scelera.”

³⁵³ James, “*De Iustificazione*”, 297. Vermigli, *Romanos*, 1182 [87]: “. . . verba est forense, quod ad iudicia spectat. . .”

³⁵⁴ Vermigli, *Romanos*, 1182 [87]

³⁵⁵ Ibid., 1290 [196]: “. . . participatio aeternae vitae.”

³⁵⁶ Emphasis added. Ibid., 1263 [171]: “Et re vera nihil aliud est Iustificatio, quàm aeterna vita iam nunc in nobis inchoate.”

sinner's guilt and offers his perfect righteousness) and the empowering presence of the Spirit—indicates that justification has been brought forward to the present.

Our final consideration of forensic imputation, before examining Martyr's view of faith, concerns the *result* of such justification for the sinner. A couple of particular benefits rush to the foreground, starting with the guarantee of absolution.³⁵⁷ This grace falls into the inaugurated eschatology schema mentioned above in which one is fully and decisively forgiven by the non-imputation of his guilt and the imputation of Christ's righteousness.³⁵⁸ This experience of forgiveness has "already" occurred. The future "not yet" dimension consists in the need for the justified to appeal to God for forgiveness on account of one's ongoing sins while also pursuing a greater apprehension of love.³⁵⁹

Along with God's forgiveness, Martyr's forensic justification also results in *Dei favor*.³⁶⁰ Combining the previous point with this one, he writes: "Moreover, as to the remission of sins, a blessing promised to us, we should remember that the chief and principal point consists in this, that we are received into favor by God and our sins forgiven us."³⁶¹ He elucidates this notion in his explanation of God's providential choosing of Jacob over Essau, where God had mercy on the former over the latter: "[that] the forgiveness of sins, in as much as men are received back into favor, does not depend on their works, but on the pure and favorable good-will of God."³⁶² With such favor, a positive relationship is established between the defendant and the judge, resulting in the former's acceptance. This forgiveness is a singular event, already realized by the justified, and, at the same time, it is gradually apprehended in one's moral life. Frank James helpfully explains:

To [Vermigli's] mind, "forgiveness" is more than a simple, single, judicial act. Forensic justification is like a pebble dropped in a pond; it creates ripples throughout the lifetime of a sinner. Certainly, it does address decisively the legal matter of guilt derived from Adam. However, even after the judicial acquittal, there remains a moral need for the

³⁵⁷ Ibid., 1182 [87]: "Deus absolvendo à peccatis."

³⁵⁸ Ibid., 1212 [119].

³⁵⁹ Ibid., 1207 [113].

³⁶⁰ Ibid., 1217 [123].

³⁶¹ Ibid., 1274 [182]: "Quod autem attinet ad remissionem peccatorum, quum nobis promissa sit benedictio, cogitare debemus, caput, & principium eius esse, ut recipiamur à Deo in gratiam, utque nobis peccata condonentur."

³⁶² Ibid., 1199 [105]: "condonationem peccatorum, utque homines in gratiam recipiantur, non pendere ab illorum operibus, sed a mera propitiaque Dei benevolentia."

justified sinner continually to seek forgiveness for subsequent sins. . . . It is this ongoing need for forgiveness, even after justification has been pronounced, that requires a necessary relationship with sanctification. . . .³⁶³

D. Faith alone

Vermigli views faith as the means of justification.³⁶⁴ After asserting that justification is “not by works” in his first proposition, he endeavors to convince readers that it is properly “received by faith.” This second proposition is supported by an arsenal of biblical texts, especially from the letter to the *Romans*, where Martyr begins.³⁶⁵ For much of his argument, Martyr has the work of Albert Pighius in his crosshairs.³⁶⁶ It is in this section that Vermigli’s rhetoric reaches new heights (or depths) of aggression, often *ad hominem* (i.e., “[Pighius] deserves to be laughed at”).³⁶⁷ One begins to discern in such comments a relationship

³⁶³ James, “Complex of Justification,” 51.

³⁶⁴ Vermigli, *Romanos*, 1253 [160].

³⁶⁵ Particular attention is given to *Romans* 4 where Martyr presses Paul’s statement, “To one who does not work but trusts him who justifies the ungodly, faith is reckoned to him as righteousness,” *Ibid.*, 1254-55 [161-162]. After surveying *Romans* up through chapter eleven, Vermigli proceeds to look at 1 and 2 Corinthians. He examines Galatians in some depth, and then looks at Ephesians, Philippians, Hebrews, 1 Peter, 1 John, the Gospels, Acts, and the Old Testament. *Ibid.*, 1258-1264 [165-172].

³⁶⁶ See especially his “Contra Pighius” section *Ibid.*, 1264-1272 [172-180] and “Pighius Redux” *Ibid.*, 1273-1298 [181-204]. A helpful summary of Pighius’s doctrine of original sin is found in Johann Feiner, *Die Erbsündenlehre Albert Pighes: ein Beitrag zur Erforschung der kath. Kontroverstheologie in der Reformationszeit*. Ph.D. thesis, Pontificia Universitas Gregoriana, 1940. Adam’s nature, according to Pighius, was not essentially wounded by original sin. “Dass Adams Natur nach Pighes Überzeugung durch die Ursünde nicht wesentlich verletzt wurde” (52). In Pighius’s view, nor can the individual take the blame for Adam’s sin, “könne den einzelnen Menschen auch keine Schuld treffen” (53). Children are therefore without guilt *coram deo*, because they have not committed a willful transgression (64). Even more unacceptable to Pighius is the notion of total depravity: “It is almost blasphemy to claim that our nature is in all parts so corrupted that our deeds stand in contradiction to God.” “Geradezu eine Gotteslästerung ist die Behauptung, unsere Natur sei in allen Teilen so verdorben, dass alle unsere Handlungen und überhaupt alles an uns zu Gott in Widerspruch stehe” (53). Even though Pighius disavows Pelagianism (63, 70, 83), in the final analysis his position bears a striking resemblance to it. The human will, according to Pighius, is weakened on account of sin, but not to the extent that it prevents one from choosing God. “Der Wille ist geschwächt, es ist ihm aber die Wahlfreiheit nicht genommen” (66). According to Feiner, this is the essential weakness of Pighius’s position—while claiming to uphold original sin, he in fact locates the cause of human guilt in an individual’s willful transgression (74).

³⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, 1286 [193].

between the intensity of Martyr's acrimony and the realization of Pighius's "Pelagianism."³⁶⁸ Less frequently does he engage the ideas of his predecessor at Oxford, Richard Smith.³⁶⁹

Over against meritorious works, faith is recognized as functioning as the active *instrumentum* by which one is declared righteous.³⁷⁰ Vermigli describes faith as that which actively "takes hold and receives" the promise of forgiveness.³⁷¹ This "most sure and certain" faith³⁷² is sharply distinguished from a "dead faith,"³⁷³ "historical faith"³⁷⁴ "human faith"³⁷⁵ "temporary faith,"³⁷⁶ and "naked" faith.³⁷⁷ It is "never alone but always draws along with it various motions of the mind," particularly "confidence, hope, and similar affections."³⁷⁸ The absence of these qualities in a person calls into question whether he truly possesses justifying faith.³⁷⁹

Vermigli affirms that faith is "a firm and certain assent (*assensus*) of the mind to the words of God, inspired by the Holy Spirit, leading to the salvation of believers."³⁸⁰ This emphasis on assent is consistent with Martyr's previous *loci*.³⁸¹ In *Romans*, however, Vermigli introduces for the first time the notion of *fiducia* (trust).³⁸² Precisely because it is

³⁶⁸ Ibid., 1287 [194]; 1289-90 [196]; 1292 [198]. In this last example Martyr writes, "Here indeed I cannot restrain myself, but must say that Pighius lies badly."

³⁶⁹ Martyr's "Smith Redux" section is significantly smaller. Ibid., 1298-1299 [204-205].

³⁷⁰ Ibid., 1261 [169] 1283 [190], 1292 [198], 1321 [227].

³⁷¹ Ibid., 1262 [170]: "apprehendimus promissiones Dei."

³⁷² Ibid., 1183 [89].

³⁷³ Ibid., 1187 [93].

³⁷⁴ Ibid., 1285-86 [192].

³⁷⁵ Ibid., 1271 [179].

³⁷⁶ Ibid., 1188 [93].

³⁷⁷ Ibid., 1266 [174].

³⁷⁸ Ibid., 1183 [89]: "id est, ut nunquam sit nuda, sed trahat secum semper multos ac varios animi motus."

³⁷⁹ Ibid., 1183 [89].

³⁸⁰ Ibid., 1184 [90]: "Est itaque firmus certusque animi assensus verbis Dei a spiritu divino afflatus ad salutem credentium."

³⁸¹ James, "De Iustificatione," 307.

³⁸² Vermigli, *Romans*, 1183 [89]: "Iure igitur a professoribus purioribus Evangelij statuitur, credere, cum actione, seu motu fiducia, spei, et similibus affectibus maximam habere coniunctionem: sed potissimum cum syncera firmaque fiducia. . ."

the Holy Spirit who inspires faith, creating “a new heart and mind,”³⁸³ faith naturally includes a volitional impulse: “In this way we say that the faith which is effective differs very much from historical assent, and that we are justified by the [enlivened] faith we have just described.”³⁸⁴ In saying this, Martyr has not jettisoned *assensus* as a constituent element of justifying faith;³⁸⁵ he has simply broadened his definition to more thoroughly account for the activation of the human will.

The third and final proposition of Vermigli’s *locus* concerns the necessity of *sola fide*, a doctrine which he staunchly defends.³⁸⁶

This saying [of *sola fide*] is proved by all those places of Scripture which teach that we are justified freely, as well as those that affirm that justification comes without works and also those that draw an antithesis between grace and works. I say that all these places truly prove that we are justified by faith only, even if this word “only” is not read in the Scriptures; but that is not of much weight, since its signification is derived from them by necessity.³⁸⁷

Martyr begins his argument for *sola fide* by expressing his disagreement with Richard Smith, whom he sarcastically describes as “the very light of divinity” (rarely does Vermigli miss an opportunity to take a swipe at Smith).³⁸⁸ Like an airplane embarking on its final descent from the grand height of 10,000 feet, Vermigli’s third proposition rushes to conclude his treatise. For some perspective on this, consider that proposition one of his *locus* occupies 72 folio pages, proposition two has 58, while number three merely has 13 pages. Moving expeditiously through this final argument, Martyr cites an array of biblical texts and church fathers to support his position.

Vermigli’s commitment to *sola fide* is born out of his belief that one’s good works have no role whatsoever in causing justification.³⁸⁹ In a rather distilled statement, he articulates the essence of this conviction:

³⁸³ Ibid., 1286 [193].

³⁸⁴ Ibid., 1286 [193].

³⁸⁵ Ibid., 1188 [94].

³⁸⁶ Ibid., 1312 [218].

³⁸⁷ Ibid.

³⁸⁸ Ibid.

³⁸⁹ Ibid.

And when we say that one is justified by faith alone we obviously say nothing else than that one is justified only by the mercy of God and by the merit of Christ, which we cannot grasp by any other instrument than faith alone.³⁹⁰

Emphatic as he is, Martyr is quick to counterbalance such statements concerning the gratuitous nature of justification with his conviction that *sola fide* must never be at the expense of sanctification. Thus, faith functions as the instrument, but it must never be seen as the totality of what is expected of a person. Vermigli offers an analogy to underscore this point: “The eye cannot be without a head, brains, heart, liver, and other parts of the body, and yet the eye alone apprehends color and light.”³⁹¹ All of the above members are essential for life, just as virtue is required for the completion of justification, for “Christ requires more of us than faith, for who doubts that he wants those who are justified to live uprightly and to practice virtue of all kinds. . . .”³⁹² Indeed, Vermigli questions whether one can actually realize eternal salvation without such (a living) virtue.³⁹³

In this closing segment, Vermigli offers a final word on two important concepts which have appeared throughout his *locus* and which have bearing on his understanding of *sola fide*: opposition to the claim that general grace is accessible to all and support of perseverance of the saints. In regard to the first of these, when Martyr accuses his opponents of maintaining a doctrine of congruent merit, he recognizes their position as a form of “Pelagianism” that is foreign to the teaching of Scripture.³⁹⁴ He outlines the Catholic teaching on merit in terms of the traditional categories of *de congruo* (that which precedes

³⁹⁰ Ibid., 1321 [227]: “Cumque dicimus, hominem iustificari sola fide, nihil sane aliud dicimus, quam hominem iustificari sola Dei misericordia, et solius Christi merito: quae non alio instrumento apprehendere possumus, quam sola fide.”

³⁹¹ Ibid., 1312 [218]: “Ita oculus non potest esse sine capite, cerebro, corde, epate, & aliis partibus corporis: & tamen colorem, & lucem solus oculus apprehendit.” Martyr offers a similar analogy a few pages later: “Surely the meat that we eat is distributed to all the members and into the whole body, and yet it is received with the mouth only and not with the whole body” 1322 [228].

³⁹² Ibid., 1318 [224]: “Quod ad primum attinet, fatemur, Christum plus a nobis requirere, quam fidem. Quis enim dubitet, eum velle homines iustificatos recte vivere, seseque per omnia virtutum genera exercere.”

³⁹³ Ibid., 1318 [224]: “alioquin ad aeternam salutem non perventuros?” Martyr follows this directly with the qualifier that such virtue is the “fruit” of faith and not its cause “Atqui fructus isti sunt fidei, & iustificationis effecta, non causae.”

³⁹⁴ Ibid., 1218-19 [125].

conversion on the basis of natural ability) and *de condigno* (merit that fully deserves a reward subsequent to conversion).³⁹⁵ Martyr holds congruent merit in contempt, asserting that “They are worse than foolish who would say that we were converted prior to the aid of God. He first loved us before we began to love him.”³⁹⁶ He regards condign merit equally unsustainable from Scripture and therefore he discards the entire system as “directly repugnant to the word of God.”³⁹⁷ In his view, if redemptive grace is obtainable prior to regeneration and appropriated by the sinner through good works, even if such works are enabled by God, the justification that follows would ultimately be based upon human effort.³⁹⁸ In his words: “They hold that there is a kind of general grace accessible to all and common even to the unregenerate, who are in a sense helped to merit justification and do works which please God. But in saying this, they fall into the heresy of Pelagius.”³⁹⁹

It should be noted that Martyr does in fact recognize a distinction between “prevenient” grace and “subsequent” grace, “*gratia subsequentem*.” Simply put, the former is identified with the initial work of the Spirit that enlivens sinners and the latter consists in sanctification. He asserts that “[prevenient grace] is nothing other than the same favor of God through Christ, which moves us beforehand to rightly exercise our will, and after we are regenerated, helps and stirs us up to live rightly.”⁴⁰⁰ As an example, Vermigli responds to his opponents’ argument from the book of Jonah where it says, “God regarded the works of the Ninevites.” Martyr explains why these works were not prevenient: “Since they believed before they did any works, they were justified by faith and not by works, which followed afterwards, and God is said to have regarded their works because they pleased him.”⁴⁰¹ Because Martyr

³⁹⁵ Ibid., 1218-1219 [125-126].

³⁹⁶ Ibid., 1217 [123-24]: “Desiperet supra modum, qui diceret nos ad nostram conversionem praevenire auxilium Dei. Ille prius nos diligit, quàm à nobis diligi incipiat.”

³⁹⁷ Ibid., 1219 [125]: “pugnare cum verbo Dei.”

³⁹⁸ Pressed through the framework of his intensive Augustinianism, Vermigli can’t begin to countenance the idea that meritorious works of the unregenerate are somehow pleasing to God. Ibid., 1195 [101], 1199 [105], 1214-15 [121-122], 1235-36 [142-143], 1260-61 [168], 1288 [194], 1313-14 [219-220].

³⁹⁹ Ibid., 1216 [123]: “Est enim, inquit, gratia quaedam generalis omnibus exposita, & communis etiam hominibus non regeneratis, qua utcunque adiuti, possint mereri iustificationem, & facere opera, quae placeant Deo. Sed hoc quum dicunt, incidunt in haeresim Pelagii.”

⁴⁰⁰ Ibid., 1217 [123].

⁴⁰¹ Ibid., 1127 [134].

regarded faithful Ninevites as regenerate, their works were therefore pleasing and acceptable to God.⁴⁰² This would be so on account of one's close association with Christ, in which one's "incomplete obedience" as a justified person effectively "pleases God."⁴⁰³ In this way, Vermigli limits *gratia praevenientem* to the Spirit's initial enlivening work and opens the door widely to *gratia subsequentem*.

In keeping with his conviction that man's best efforts to secure divine favor through good works are in vain (i.e., justification cannot be merited), Vermigli also maintains a doctrine of perseverance, which, in a sense, affirms the inverse (i.e., justification of one who is in Christ is secure, even when he may commit a serious sin). He writes:

In general, it may be stated that faith cannot be completely extinguished because serious sins are committed by the justified and those destined to salvation. In such cases, faith is lulled to sleep and lies hidden and does not burst forth into action unless awakened again by the Holy Spirit. In such fallen ones, the seed of God remains, although for a time it produces no fruit.⁴⁰⁴

Martyr seems to be saying that when the regenerate lapses into sin, even serious sin, his justification remains secure ("the seed of God remains"). He acknowledges that "true faith," *fidem veram*, sometimes "slips" or is "lulled to sleep," but is not lost.⁴⁰⁵ In his words:

"Therefore those who seek God, to be justified by him through faith, as the apostle teaches, attain what they desire; but those who would be justified by works fall away from justification."⁴⁰⁶

Not everyone agrees that Vermigli's doctrine of justification includes the idea of perseverance. John Patrick Donnelly argues the following:

Martyr does not hold the doctrine of perseverance of the saints as interpreted by many later Calvinists, that once man has received justifying faith, he never falls from grace and justification. On the contrary, Vermigli teaches that man can fall into sin and

⁴⁰² Ibid., 1227-28 [134].

⁴⁰³ Ibid., 1229 [136].

⁴⁰⁴ Ibid., 1278 [186].

⁴⁰⁵ Ibid., 1302 [208]: "amitti... aut ita consopiri ut suum."

⁴⁰⁶ Ibid., 1288 [194]: "Quare, qui quaerunt Deum ut ab eo iustificentur ex fide, quemadmodum Apostolus docet, assequuntur id, quod optant: Illi vero, qui iustificari volunt ex operibus, exicidunt a iustificatione."

thereby lose justification, but as often as he truly assents to God's promises he recovers justification.⁴⁰⁷

Donnelly points to a statement from Martyr's *Romans locus* which seems to suggest that justification can be lost and subsequently reclaimed: "Indeed justification is not only taken hold of once, but as often as we truly and effectually assent to God's promises, for since we continually slip and fall into sins, it is necessary that our justification should be repeatedly renewed."⁴⁰⁸ Frank James, in his doctoral dissertation *De Iustificazione*, takes issue with Donnelly. He finds Donnelly's citation to be less than convincing in Vermigli's context and also inconsistent with what Vermigli writes elsewhere on the topic.⁴⁰⁹

With regard to the context of Vermigli's statement, Martyr is answering Pighius who had argued from the narrative of Abraham that the Patriarch was not justified by faith for the remission of sins in the Christian sense (since he lived centuries before Christ).⁴¹⁰ Vermigli responds by quoting Paul in Galatians 3 where the Apostle assigns Christian content to Abraham's faith.⁴¹¹ Vermigli then argues that like Abraham, whose faith was reclaimed in Genesis chapter 15 (after his initial justification, recorded in chapter 12), Christians must likewise reassert their belief in the promises of God. This is so, according to Martyr, because "Our minds are so weak that unless the words of God are repeated and impressed upon us, we

⁴⁰⁷ Donnelly, *Calvinism and Scholasticism*, 154.

⁴⁰⁸ Vermigli, *Romanos*, 1275 [182]: "Neque vero iustificatio semel tantum apprehenditur, sed quoties promissionibus divinis, vere atque efficaciter assentimur. Nam quum assidue labamur, et incidamus in peccata, opus habemus subinde repetita iustificatione." Donnelly quotes from Peter Martyr's *Loci Communes*. Ex variis ipsius Authoris libris in unum volumen collecti, & quatuor classes distribute. Ed. by Robert Masson. (London: Thomas Vautrollerius, 1583), 545.

⁴⁰⁹ In footnote 319 on page 349 of his thesis, *De Iustificazione*, James mentions that Donnelly's *Calvinism and Scholasticism* "cites from the 1587 edition of the *Loci Communes*...." In fact, it is the 1583 version from which Donnelly quotes. This is noteworthy since James takes Donnelly to task for referencing the wrong edition and incorrect pages. Even with the correct version and proper pagination, however, Donnelly's reference to a second statement by Martyr which purportedly undermines the doctrine of perseverance is still lacking (he cites page 491 of Vermigli's 1583 *Loci, Calvinism and Scholasticism*, p. 154, fn. 91). There were 14 editions of Vermigli's *Loci Communes* following the first edition in 1576, 13 in Latin and one in English, Joseph C. McLelland, "A Literary History of the *LOCI COMMUNES*," in *A Companion to Peter Martyr Vermigli*, ed. W. J. Torrance Kirby, Emidio Campi, and Frank A. James, III (Leiden: Brill, 2009), 488-494.

⁴¹⁰ Vermigli, *Romanos*, 1273-5 [181-182].

⁴¹¹ *Ibid.*, 1273-74 [181-182].

easily resist faith.”⁴¹² Then, immediately after this sentence, comes the controversial statement concerning the need for justification to be “taken hold of” more than once, owing to our continual slips and falls into sins, necessitating that “our justification should be repeatedly renewed.”⁴¹³ After analyzing this context, James concludes:

It seems clear that the issue Vermigli is addressing is the weakness of human faith not the weakness of divine justification. Vermigli is admitting that even in the justified person, faith needs rekindling at times. But he is not at all suggesting that a person can fall out of justification, since justification is exclusively the work of God and not man, as Vermigli understands it. For him, divine justification is not subject to the weaknesses of fallen creatures, but is determined by the faithfulness of God. This is confirmed in the paragraphs immediately following our text, where Vermigli stresses that the power of justifying faith lies not in the faith of the individual, but in the object of faith, namely, Christ.⁴¹⁴

The disagreement between Donnelly and James highlights the tension of Vermigli’s doctrine of justification. Let us recall James’s statement with which we concluded our previous section: “justification is like a pebble dropped in a pond” creating ripples throughout the lifetime of the sinner such that one has an “ongoing need for forgiveness, even after justification has been pronounced.” To the extent that justification entails this ongoing, future-directed movement which includes sanctification, Donnelly’s suggestion that one may fall away from justification on account of sin is sustainable. Furthermore, Donnelly is undoubtedly right that this position of Vermigli’s differs from that of latter Calvinists insofar as such Reformed thinkers more clearly distinguish the categories of justification and sanctification in Calvin’s *duplex gratia*.⁴¹⁵ However, the subtlety with which Vermigli defines justification in terms of a first righteousness, which, in a strict sense, is purely forensic, followed by the broader expression of righteousness in an ongoing development of virtue, makes it difficult to define his position on perseverance with quite as much clarity and precision.

After the nuances of Vermigli’s doctrine have been observed and requisite qualifications have been made, we must ultimately disagree with Donnelly, if, by his assertion that “Vermigli teaches that man can fall into sin and thereby lose justification,” he means to say that one loses his righteous state *coram deo*. Because the formal cause of one’s justified

⁴¹² Ibid., 1275 [182].

⁴¹³ Ibid.

⁴¹⁴ James, “*De Iustificatione*,” 351.

⁴¹⁵ John Calvin, *Institutes*, 3.2.11, 3.24.4-11.

state is understood to be the imputation of Christ's righteousness,⁴¹⁶ those who have genuinely believed, according to Vermigli, are expected to realize future justification.⁴¹⁷ Such faith, says Martyr, "cannot be completely extinguished,"⁴¹⁸ even though the experience of sin necessitates Christians to repeatedly take hold of and renew the reality of their justification. In short, since Martyr understands God's redemptive activity to be immutable and efficacious, those whom he regenerates are expected to persevere.⁴¹⁹

There is precious little in Vermigli's *Romans locus* (or any of his *loci* on justification) on the role of the sacraments in mediating justifying grace. He first addresses the issue in proposition one where he confronts the position of his opponents with regard to the role of ceremonies.⁴²⁰ Martyr finds the Catholic position inconsistent for the way it ascribes "the forgiveness of sins and bestowing of grace to the sacraments, just as in the Old Testament they were attributed to circumcision."⁴²¹ Apparently his opponent's position also regarded the ceremony of circumcision as having a continuing validity in the New Testament sacraments such that it contained the "power of justifying."⁴²² In no uncertain terms, Martyr opposes this notion:

Indeed, we utterly deny that any sacraments bestow grace. They do offer grace, but it is by signification. For in sacraments and words, and in the visible signs, the promises of God made through Christ are set before us. If we take hold of those promises by faith,

⁴¹⁶ Martyr expresses general agreement with the causal framework of Trent in terms of the "final" cause (the glory of God), the "efficient" cause (divine mercy), and the "meritorious" cause (the death and resurrection of Christ). After addressing each of these, Vermigli explains that the point of contention is the "*causam formalem*." Unlike Trent, which defines the formal cause in terms of the righteousness with which one is counted *and made* just, Vermigli, with Protestantism, limits the strict sense of justification to the forensic reckoning of righteousness. He thus concludes this section, "Therefore, we say that justification cannot consist in that righteousness and renewal by which we are created anew by God. For it is imperfect because of our corruption, so that we are not able to stand before the judgment of Christ." Vermigli, *Romanos*, 1251-1252 [159].

⁴¹⁷ So Vermigli's quotes John 6:40: "This is the will of my Father, that everyone who sees the Son and believes in him should have eternal life." He then concludes, "Therefore, we infer this: I believe in the Son of God; therefore, I have now and shall have what he has promised." Ibid., 1293 [1990]. (cf. 1252 [159]).

⁴¹⁸ Ibid., 1278 [186].

⁴¹⁹ Ibid., 1253-1254 [160-161, 1292-1293 [198-200], 1315-1316 [221-222].

⁴²⁰ Ibid., 1208-1209 [115-116].

⁴²¹ Ibid., 1212 [118-119].

⁴²² Ibid., 1212 [119]. "vim iustificandi. . ."

we obtain a greater grace than we had before. And with the seal of the sacraments, we seal the gift of God that we embraced by faith.⁴²³

In keeping with this statement, Vermigli explicitly rejects the Catholic doctrine of baptismal regeneration.⁴²⁴ To make the point, he showcases Abraham who was justified by faith before receiving the sign of circumcision. Likewise, says Martyr, believers in Christ are justified before they are baptized, “for our baptism corresponds to the circumcision of the ancients.”⁴²⁵ He also repudiates the sacrament of penance, “Auricular confession also, derived from the papists, is completely superstitious; therefore we utterly reject it, for they impose it as something necessary for salvation and a reason why sins should be forgiven, which they are never able to provide from the testimonies of Scripture.”⁴²⁶ Ceremonies have no power to justify, according to Vermigli, any more than do the virtues of love and hope.⁴²⁷ “So great is the opposition between grace and works,” Martyr concludes, “that Paul says, ‘If of grace then it is not now of works, and if of works, then it is not of grace.’”⁴²⁸

By the time Vermigli reaches the conclusion of his *locus*, he has forcefully argued that “justification exists by faith alone.” All along, it has been the main idea toward which his treatise has driven; now, at his conclusion, it is where he lands. In light of this strong emphasis, it can be difficult to understand how Vermigli’s doctrine of justification holds *sola fide* together with the sanctifying work of the Holy Spirit. In other words, what is the logical relationship

⁴²³ Ibid. Later in his *locus*, in proposition three, Martyr makes a similar point: “As to the sacraments, we have often taught how justification is to be attributed to them, for they stand in relation to justification as does the preaching of the Gospel and the promise of Christ offered to us for salvation” 1318 [224].

⁴²⁴ Ibid., 1251 [158].

⁴²⁵ Ibid., 1251 [159]. See also 1315 [221]. Martyr envisages adult believers in his analogy to Abraham. In the case of baptized infants, it was the faith of one’s parents extended covenantally to their children that constituted the justification which properly precedes baptism. For an explanation of Vermigli’s view of baptism in the context of his covenantal theology, see Peter A. Lillback. “The Early Reformed Covenant Paradigm: Vermigli in the Context of Bullinger, Luther, and Calvin. In *Peter Martyr Vermigli and the European Reformations: Semper Reformanda*, edited by Frank A. James, III. (Leiden: Brill, 2004), 70-96. Joseph McLelland also addresses this subject in *The Visible Words of God*, 152-159.

⁴²⁶ Ibid., 1230 [136].

⁴²⁷ Ibid., 1315-1315 [221-222].

⁴²⁸ Ibid., 1316 [222].

between these two forms of righteousness? The answer to this question comes into focus when we analyze justification's formal cause.

E. Justification's Formal Cause and the *Duplex Iustitia*

Unlike Newman, who dedicates an entire lecture (number two) and a full appendix to the "formal cause" of justification, Vermigli only gives the terminology passing attention. The passage in which he explicitly addresses it is in proposition one where he counters the claims of the Council of Trent.⁴²⁹ After citing the Council's position on the "final," "efficient," and "meritorious" causes of justification, he analyzes its definition of the "formal" cause. Martyr affirms the forensic character of the Catholic position which goes so far as to count one just through the extension of forgiveness. However, Vermigli strongly disagrees with the Catholic assertion that the actual righteousness of a believer, even though it is said to be empowered by the Holy Spirit, also constitutes a ground of justification. Such a view, he argues, contradicts the teaching of Paul, David, and Abraham, each of whom posit imputation as justification's formal cause.⁴³⁰ Martyr then concludes, "Therefore, we say that justification cannot consist in that righteousness and renewal by which we are created anew by God. For it is imperfect because of our corruption, so that we are not able to stand before the judgment of Christ."⁴³¹ For Peter Martyr, the imputation of Christ's righteousness is the only formal cause.⁴³²

Vermigli's intensive Augustinianism, as we have already seen, underlies his conviction that justification is properly grounded in the imputation of Christ's righteousness apart from meritorious works.⁴³³ As he says: "'Christ is of no advantage to you'; for if you have justification as the fruit of your works, then Christ's coming, death, and shedding of blood would not have been necessary."⁴³⁴ Throughout his *locus*, Martyr repeats this essential point, repudiating the

⁴²⁹ Ibid., 1252 [159]. For other references to the cause(s) of justification see 1228 [135] and 1253 [160], although neither of them specifically deals with justification's formal cause.

⁴³⁰ Ibid. Vermigli cites *Romans* 4:5, *Psalms* 32, and *Genesis* 15:6.

⁴³¹ Ibid.

⁴³² Ibid., 1182 [88]; 1251-1252 [159].

⁴³³ Ibid., 1182 [88].

⁴³⁴ Ibid., 1203 [109]: "Atque adhuc magis quod dictum est, confirmavit, Christus vobis factus est ociosus: nam si iustificationem habetis, ut fructum operum vestrorum, Christi adventus, mors, et sanguinis effusio non fuerunt necessaria."

notion that good works can serve as the formal cause;⁴³⁵ whether such works consist in the observance of ceremonial laws,⁴³⁶ moral admonitions,⁴³⁷ or in virtues such as love, they all inevitably fall short.⁴³⁸ Simply put, Martyr understands good works to be an *effect* of justification and not a *cause*.⁴³⁹

Since a positive statement of Vermigli's doctrine of justification would essentially replicate what we have offered above with regard to his forensic framework (i.e., *imputatio, coram deo, extra nos, forense, absolutio, dei favor*) we would like to approach the subject from a different angle, one that also addresses the question with which we concluded the previous section: what is the relationship between the imputation of Christ's righteousness accessed by *sola fide* (the formal cause) and the sanctifying work of the Holy Spirit which creates a habit of grace (which he calls a "different kind of justification")?⁴⁴⁰

One way to describe the relationship of forensic imputation and the actual righteousness wrought by the Spirit is in terms of a *duplex iustitia*. Klaus Sturm, for instance, makes this proposal when he evaluates Vermigli's doctrine of justification against the background of Italian *Evangelisme*. He writes, "In the final analysis, it seems to me that Martyr's doctrine of justification concurs with that of Contarini . . ."⁴⁴¹ In this same context where he considers Regensburg's two-fold righteousness (*doppelten Rechtfertigung*), Sturm makes a similar correlation to Bucer.⁴⁴²

⁴³⁵ Ibid., 1195-1196 [101]; 1201-1202 [107-108]; 1213 [120]; 1238 [144-145]; 1279-1280 [186-188]; 1312-1313 [218-220].

⁴³⁶ Ibid., 11989-90 [95-96]; 1202-1203 [108-109]; 1209-1210 [115-116]; 1251 [158].

⁴³⁷ 1209 [116]; 1224 [131]; 1315-1315 [221-222]. Against those who argue that one can be justified by observing the moral law, Vermigli marshals a catena of biblical texts from Paul's epistles (especially from *Romans*) before finally concluding: "I would like to find out from these fellows why they remove the power of justifying from the works of ceremonies and so easily attribute it to our moral works." Ibid., 1211 [118].

⁴³⁸ Ibid. 1188-1189 [94-95].

⁴³⁹ Ibid., 1228 [135]: "Illi enim semper statuunt bona opera causas esse iustitiae: cum ea re vera iustitiae effecta sint, non causae."

⁴⁴⁰ Vermigli, *PMR*, 147.

⁴⁴¹ Klaus Sturm, *Die Theologie Peter Martyr Vermiglis während seines ersten Aufenthalts in Strassburg 1542-1547: Ein Reformkatholik unter den Vätern der reformierten Kirche*, Beiträge zur Geschichte und Lehre der Reformierten Kirche (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1971), 69. "Im Ergebnis scheint mir Martyrs Rechtfertigungslehre... mit der Contarinis übereinzustimmen."

⁴⁴² In the very next sentence he writes: "Aber auch Bucer hat ganz ähnlich über die Rechtfertigungslehre gedacht." Ibid.

There is good historical reason for evaluating Vermigli's doctrine of justification in light of the *duplex iustitia* commonly associated with Contarini. After the Colloquy of Regensburg concluded (July 29, 1541), Contarini traveled to the Italian city of Lucca to attend a summit between Emperor Charles V and Pope Paul III.⁴⁴³ Arriving for its start in September 7, Contarini found lodging at Vermigli's monastery of San Frediano.⁴⁴⁴ Simler indicates that during these days, "Martyr and Contarini held daily discussions about religion."⁴⁴⁵ According to Simler, these discussions revolved around the Regensburg debate. McNair has little doubt that the particular topic of discussion was the *duplex iustitia*.⁴⁴⁶

In his chapter titled "The Complex of Justification: Peter Martyr Vermigli Versus Albert Pighius," Frank James acknowledges that the *duplex iustitia* of Contarini and other members of Italian *Evangelisme* influenced the early stages of Vermigli's doctrine of justification.⁴⁴⁷ James argues, however, that a parallel between Vermigli and Contarini and the *Spirituali* with reference to *duplex iustitia* is "overdrawn"⁴⁴⁸ and in danger of obscuring the Protestant character of Martyr's position.⁴⁴⁹ According to James, after traveling north of the Alps in 1542, Vermigli eventually distanced himself from the doctrine of twofold righteousness, which he had imbibed from such people as Contarini and Valdés in Italy, in exchange for Bucer's *tres partes* conception of justification, which he encountered in Strasbourg during the subsequent five years (1542-1547).⁴⁵⁰ While much of James's argument is persuasive, we shall argue that it is unwarranted to so sharply distinguish the Protestant Vermigli from the *duplex iustitia*. It is our contention that the Neapolitan influence not only established the foundation of Martyr's doctrine; it continued to define its shape into its most mature form. Thus, even though Peter Martyr doesn't explicitly describe his position with the term *duplex*

⁴⁴³ Elisabeth Gleason, *Gasparo Contarini: Venice, Rome, and Reform* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993), 259. Marvin W. Anderson, *Peter Martyr, a Reformer in Exile (1542-1562): A Chronology of Biblical Writings in England & Europe* (Nieuwkoop: De Graaf, 1975), 46.

⁴⁴⁴ Philip McNair, *PMI*, 233.

⁴⁴⁵ Josias Simler, *Life, Letters, and Sermons*, trans. and ed. John Patrick Donnelly, *The Peter Martyr Library* 5 (Kirkville, MO: Thomas Jefferson University Press, 1999), 24-25.

⁴⁴⁶ "It is easy enough to conjecture what the two friends discussed—the doctrine of *duplex iustitia*" McNair, *PMI*, 234.

⁴⁴⁷ James, "Complex of Justification," 57.

⁴⁴⁸ *Ibid.*

⁴⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, 56.

⁴⁵⁰ Vermigli, *In primum librum Mosis*, 59.

iustitia, nevertheless, twofold righteousness continues throughout his life to be the essential substructure of his doctrine of justification.⁴⁵¹

In his chapter, James argues against Klaus Sturm⁴⁵² and also John Patrick Donnelly,⁴⁵³ who portray Vermigli's doctrine of justification as that of a "*Reformkatholik*."⁴⁵⁴ One reason for their assertion is the close proximity of forensic justification with regeneration and sanctification in Vermigli's threefold schema. Indeed, Sturm goes so far as to assert that it is "difficult to determine whether Martyr's doctrine of justification would be justifiably condemned on the basis of Trent's canons on justification. . . ."⁴⁵⁵ James rejects the *Reformkatholik* label, and explains convincingly why Vermigli's doctrine of justification is best understood as "thoroughly Protestant."⁴⁵⁶ James is also correct to emphasize the development of Vermigli's complex of justification in basic agreement with Bucer. The problem with his argument is the way he seeks to distance the Italian reformer from the doctrine of *duplex iustitia* by means of pitting Vermigli against Albert Pighius.

In Peter Martyr's view, Pighius was "the chief spokesman for the Roman Catholic theology of grace, original sin, and free will," and, therefore, as we have noted, Martyr's *Romans* commentary engages him by name dozens of times.⁴⁵⁷ More to the point, Vermigli regarded Pighius as the "champion of contemporary Pelagians,"⁴⁵⁸ as did Calvin,⁴⁵⁹ an error that could not go unopposed. In his argument against Sturm, James is quite clear that it is the Augustinian anthropology of Vermigli that motivates him to refute Pighius's

⁴⁵¹ This is the position of Klaus Sturm who recognizes fundamental compatibility between Vermigli and *duplex iustitia*, even though Vermigli doesn't formally uphold the position. Sturm, *Die Theologie Peter Martyr*, 69.

⁴⁵² Sturm, *Die Theologie Peter Martyr*, 62-68.

⁴⁵³ Donnelly, *Calvinism and Scholasticism*, 154.

⁴⁵⁴ James, "Complex of Justification," 45, 53, 55; Cf. Sturm, *Die Theologie Peter Martyr*, 62-68.

⁴⁵⁵ Sturm, *Die Theologie Peter Martyr*, 69. "Es ist wirklich schwer zu beurteilen, ob Martyrs Rechtfertigungslehre der Verurteilung nach dem Maßstab der Trienter Canones de iustificatione...."

⁴⁵⁶ James provides evidence to this effect such as Vermigli's ardent opposition of Trent, and that he was acknowledged as a Protestant by opponents and supporters alike. James, "Complex of Justification," 56.

⁴⁵⁷ Donnelly, *Calvinism and Scholasticism*, 39.

⁴⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, 105; James, "Complex of Justification," xxvii.

⁴⁵⁹ John Calvin, *The Bondage and Liberation of the Will: A Defence of the Orthodox Doctrine of Human Choice against Pighius*, ed. A. N. S. Lane, trans. G. I. Davies, Texts and Studies in Reformation and Post-reformation Thought 2 (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 1996), xx.

Pelagianism.⁴⁶⁰

Pighius's argument against *sola fide* challenges the notion that faith is considered the sole instrumental cause.⁴⁶¹ He contends that "love (*caritas*), instead of faith, justifies, because love is more noble and excellent virtue."⁴⁶² Vermigli elucidates the heart of this disagreement when he writes, "Here lies the whole controversy: to which of these virtues is justification to be chiefly ascribed?"⁴⁶³ In no uncertain terms Martyr identifies faith over love as the proper instrument by which justifying grace is appropriated:

Therefore, in this matter of justification, although there are many other works of the Holy Spirit in our hearts, yet none except faith leads to justification. Thus the apostle concludes, "neither circumcision nor uncircumcision is of any avail, but faith working through love."⁴⁶⁴

At the same time, Vermigli addresses Pighius's doctrine of original sin and preparatory works (as Calvin did), and, like Calvin, Vermigli opposes what he regards as Pighian "Pelagianism."⁴⁶⁵ Summarizing the logic of Pighius's position, Vermigli explains how the Dutchman was fond of using John 1:12, "God gave them power to become sons of God," to argue that one must exercise his will in the application of this divine empowerment in order to be justified. Such human effort, in Martyr's view, amounted to works righteousness. Thus, it was Pighius's insistence on these preparatory works and his failure to subordinate *iustitia operum* to the *iustitia fidei* that roused Vermigli's ire against him.⁴⁶⁶

⁴⁶⁰ James writes, "The most significant theological insight into Vermigli's choice of Pighius as his main Catholic antagonist stems from his Augustinian anthropology." James, "Complex of Justification," 55.

⁴⁶¹ In the context of this second proposition, Vermigli reflects on the causes of justification from *Romans* chapter 1. The efficient cause is God's power. The final cause is our [future] salvation, the instrumental cause is faith. Vermigli, *Romanos*, 1252-1253 [160].

⁴⁶² Vermigli, *Romanos*, 1276 [184].

⁴⁶³ Ibid., 1282 [189].

⁴⁶⁴ Ibid., 1260 [167-168].

⁴⁶⁵ Vermigli makes essentially the same case against the Council of Trent, Ibid., 1249-1253 [156-160].

⁴⁶⁶ Ibid., 192, 194-195. This position follows naturally from Pighius's anthropology: that in original sin Adam's offspring embraced guilt and death, but not corruption. For this reason, Pighius argued that man has the power to choose righteousness, leading to the appropriation of actual righteousness. In view of this emphasis, Hubert Jedin speaks of Pighius's "almost Pelagian view of

When Claus Sturm argues for Vermigli's *Reformkatholik* orientation, he emphasizes the Italian Reformer's close theological proximity to the *Spirituali*, especially to Contarini, Seripando, and Gropper, and to the notion of *duplex iustitia* espoused by the Colloquy of Regensburg.⁴⁶⁷ At this point, James protests, describing Sturms's association of Vermigli with the *duplex iustitia* an "interpretive problem," precisely because Vermigli placed Pighius in the crosshairs of his justification polemic. Since James labels Pighius a "moderate,"⁴⁶⁸ who was present at Regensburg supporting Gropper and Contarini, the logical deduction is that Vermigli must have moved away from the *duplex iustitia*. The implication seems to be that by moving away from two-fold righteousness Vermigli became less Catholic and more Protestant.

There are four reasons to question whether Vermigli did in fact move away from a doctrine of *duplex iustitia*. First, it is reasonable to doubt whether Pighius was indeed a "moderate" Catholic of Contarini's ilk. Edward Yarnold explains that while Pighius acknowledges one's dependence upon imputed justice, it "is more a matter of vocabulary than of theology."⁴⁶⁹ Over against Pighius, the Catholics at Regensburg in their second draft asserted that the ungodly are "justified freely without any preceding merit and without works of the law."⁴⁷⁰ Such a view is out of step with Pighius' position, which recognizes in human volition the ability to secure justifying grace.⁴⁷¹ Furthermore, the Catholic Church also had reservations about Pighius's orthodoxy, especially his explanation of original sin, as evidenced in the Council of Trent's rejection of his doctrine.⁴⁷² The Council's opposition to

human moral ability." Hubert Jedin, *Studien über die schriftstellertätigkeit Albert Pigges*, Reformationsgeschichtliche Studien und Texte 55 (Münster: Aschendorff, 1931), 11.

⁴⁶⁷ Sturm, *Die Theologie Peter Martyr*, 67; James, "Complex of Justification," 46.

⁴⁶⁸ James, "Complex of Justification," 46, 56.

⁴⁶⁹ Edward Yarnold, "Duplex iustitia: The Sixteenth Century and the Twentieth," in *Christian Authority: Essays in Honour of Henry Chadwick*, ed. G. R. Evans (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1988), 204-223, esp. 210.

⁴⁷⁰ Brian Lugoio, *Martin Bucer's Doctrine of Justification: Reformation Theology and Early Modern Irenicism*, Oxford Studies in Historical Theology (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), 189.

⁴⁷¹ According to Vermigli, Pighius emphasized the doing of God's commandments on the strength of one's will as the way to be justified. Vermigli, *Romanos*, 1273-1282 [181-189]. See also Johann Feiner, *Die Erbsündenlehre Albert Pigges*, 66. John Calvin makes a similar accusation against Pighius, *The Bondage and Liberation of the Will*, 104-106.

⁴⁷² Hubert Jedin, *A History of the Council of Trent*, trans. Ernest Graf, vol. 2 (London: T. Nelson, 1961), 145, 153.

semi-Pelagianism rendered Pighius's formulation untenable and the Spanish Inquisition eventually put his *De libero hominis arbitrio* on the Index of forbidden books.⁴⁷³ Pighius may have attended Regensburg, but his ideas on the efficacy of grace were at odds with moderate Catholics.⁴⁷⁴

Second, some of the Catholics at Regensburg were apparently extending themselves in ecumenical solidarity with Protestants beyond the point of their actual belief. An account of this is found in the work of Brian Lugioyo. In his overview of the various drafts through which Article Five passed before reaching its final version, Lugioyo describes the Catholic edition written by Gropper, submitted on April 29, which omitted the phrase *per fidem* and emphasized the role of works as the primary ground upon which the ungodly are justified.⁴⁷⁵ With this strong dependence upon works, the draft reflects what would become a more conservative Catholic position, as evidenced in just a few years by the Canons of Trent and the anti-Protestant polemics of Pighius.

Third, there is consensus on the compatibility of Bucer's and Calvin's doctrine of justification with the *duplex iustitia*.⁴⁷⁶ It must be remembered that Bucer co-authored the so called Regensburg Book with Gropper.⁴⁷⁷ His *duplex iustificatio* included the remission of sins by imputation and an impartation of righteousness by the Spirit,⁴⁷⁸ elements that are

⁴⁷³ Philip Schaff, *The History of Creeds*, 4th ed., The Creeds of Christendom, with a History and Critical Notes 1 (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1877), 474.

⁴⁷⁴ While it is true that Contarini was shunned by Carafa and other rigid conservatives following Regensburg, it was not on account of heresy. Gleason, *Gasparo Contarini*, 257-276. Just thirty years later, the Sorbonne was to pronounce Contarini's position acceptable. A. G. Dickens, *The Counter Reformation*, Library of European Civilization (London: Thames and Hudson, 1968), 105.

⁴⁷⁵ Lugioyo, *Martin Bucer's Doctrine of Justification*, 190.

⁴⁷⁶ Ibid., 202-203; Peter Matheson, "Martin Bucer and the Old Church," in *Martin Bucer: Reforming Church and Community*, ed. David F. Wright (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 5-16; Alister E. McGrath, "Humanist Elements in the Early Reformed Doctrine of Justification," *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte* 73 (1982): 5-20.

⁴⁷⁷ Hastings Eells, "The Origin of the Regensburg Book," *The Princeton Theological Review* 26, no. 3 (1928): 355-372.

⁴⁷⁸ Bucer describes this impartation as "a certain persuasion of the Holy Spirit concerning the gospel," "certa Spiritus sancti de Evangelio persuasio." Martin Bucer, *Metaphrasis et enarratio in epist. d. Pauli apostoli ad Romanos, in quibus singulatim apostoli omnia, cum argumenta, tum sententiae & verba, ad auctoritatem divinae scripturae, fidemque ecclesiae Catholicae tam priscae quam praesentis, religiosè ac paulò fusius excutiuntur* (Basel: Apud Petrum Pernam, 1562), 425.

consonant with Vermigli's position.⁴⁷⁹ On account of the Holy Spirit, those who are justified by faith (*prima iustificatio*) will also be "justified" by works (*secundaria iustificatio*).⁴⁸⁰ These are different words to describe the essence of Peter Martyr's position.⁴⁸¹ Since Martyr's doctrine of justification was in principle consistent with Bucer's, and Bucer's position remained compatible with Article Five, there is a logical harmony between Vermigli's doctrine of justification and the *duplex iustitia*.

In addition to Bucer, John Calvin's doctrine of justification evinces the same general agreement to *duplex iustitia*, as Calvin's own statement to Farel confirms.⁴⁸² On this point, A. N. S. Lane sheds direct light:

How does this doctrine of *duplex iustitia* compare with Calvin's teaching? The idea is fundamental to Calvin's theology of salvation although the actual term he used only in a negative sense, when opposing Osiander's teaching on justification (*Inst.* 3:11:11f. [1559]). The idea of *duplex iustitia*, in the sense that it is understood in Article 5, is found in his references to a *duplex gratia*, referring to justification and sanctification (*Inst.* 3:11:1 [1539], 6 [1559]).⁴⁸³

⁴⁷⁹ Vermigli conveys his adherence to *duplex iustificatio* when he contrasts the two meanings of justification: the present reckoning of imputation and the future realization of actual righteousness, *Corinthios*, 19 [147]; *Romanos*, 1182 [88]. McGrath suggests that a "doctrine of double justification", in the strict sense of the term (as it is encountered during the Tridentine proceedings on justification), is essentially a doctrine of a *double formal cause of justification*. . . ." *ID*, 313. In this sense, Vermigli's doctrine (because it posits imputation as the single formal cause) is not a strict *duplex iustificatio*.

⁴⁸⁰ Bucer, *Metaphrasis et enarratio in epist. d. Pauli apostoli ad Romanos*, 232. We noted in our introduction Brian Lugioyo's helpful point that "Bucer's use of *secundaria* hints not to a [temporal] following (*secunda*) but to an inferior or second-rate justification that highlights the superiority of the first." Brian Lugioyo, *Martin Bucer's Doctrine of Justification*, 189.98, n. 297

⁴⁸¹ This assertion, once again, is predicated on Vermigli's distinction between a present, forensic justification versus an actual realization of justification which occurs in the future. Vermigli, *Corinthios*, 19 [147]; *Romanos*, 1182 [88].

⁴⁸² So Calvin writes to Farel about Regensburg's Article Five: "Our friends have thus retained also the substance of the true doctrine, so that nothing can be comprehended within it which is not to be found in our writings. . . . Anthony N. S. Lane, *Justification by Faith in Catholic-Protestant Dialogue: An Evangelical Assessment* (London: T & T Clark, 2002), 56.

⁴⁸³ Lane, "Calvin and Article 5," 233-263, esp. 260. Following up on this point, Lane offers a helpful qualifier, "Why is Calvin in his *Institutio* willing to concede human righteousness in one context but not in the other? When the question is growth in the Christian life, he is happy to refer to human righteousness, but when the issue is acceptance by God he emphasizes the worthlessness of human righteousness. In the former context the reality of human righteousness is the issue, in the latter its imperfection." *Ibid.*, 261.

Fourthly and finally, we find the doctrine of *duplex iustitia* in Vermigli's theological offspring, men such as John Jewel and Richard Hooker.⁴⁸⁴ Jewel served as Vermigli's notary during the Oxford disputation, and then, following Mary's ascension to the English throne, he found refuge in the home of Martyr in Strasbourg and Zurich.⁴⁸⁵ Like Vermigli, Bucer, and other Reformed thinkers, Jewel recognizes the need for twofold righteousness in the doctrine of justification. Quoting Thomas Aquinas, Jewel affirms "works are said to justify, not as justification is the procuring of righteousness, but in that it is an exercise or a shewing or a perfecting of righteousness. For we say a thing is done, when it is perfected or known to be done."⁴⁸⁶

Jewel's protégé, Richard Hooker, continued in this same trajectory.⁴⁸⁷ Identifying one of the greatest merits of Hooker's soteriology, Corneliu C. Simuț points to "the synthesis between justification and sanctification," which he credits to the influence of Martin Bucer and his theory of double justification.⁴⁸⁸ In Hooker's words:

Which thing being attentively marked, sheweth plainly how the faith of true believers cannot be divorced from hope and love; how faith is part of sanctification, and yet unto justification necessary; how faith is perfected by good works, and yet not works of ours good without faith: finally, how our fathers might hold, we are justified by faith alone, and yet hold truly that without good works we are not justified.⁴⁸⁹

⁴⁸⁴ So McNair opens his Introduction of *Peter Martyr in Italy* describing Vermigli as Jewel's theological father and as Hooker's grandfather, xiii.

⁴⁸⁵ Jewel remained an affectionate disciple thereafter, writing of his mentor, "Doctor Peter Martyr, of whom I cannot speak without great reverence...." John Jewel, *The Works of John Jewel, Bishop of Salisbury*, ed. John Ayre, vol. 3 (Cambridge, UK: The University Press, 1848), 646.

⁴⁸⁶ John Jewel, *The Works of John Jewel, Bishop of Salisbury*, ed. John Ayre, vol. 3 (Cambridge, UK: The University Press, 1848), 300. Philip Edgcumbe Hughes describes how Jewel maintained a fierce commitment to *sola fide* without denigrating the necessity of works in Philip Edgcumbe Hughes, ed. *Faith and Works: Cranmer and Hooker on Justification* (Wilton, CT: Morehouse-Barlow Co., 1982), 39.

⁴⁸⁷ In addition to his connection to Vermigli through Jewel, Richard Hooker may have learned about Peter Martyr from his Uncle, John Hooker, a historian and scholar from Exeter, who had lodged with Vermigli while studying at Strassburg. Diarmaid MacCulloch, *The Reformation* (New York: Viking, 2003), 486. Gary Jenkins states that Martyr also influenced Hooker through his Puritan tutor, John Rainolds, "Peter Martyr and the Church of England after 1558," in *Peter Martyr Vermigli and the European Reformations: Semper Reformanda*, ed. Frank A. James, III (Leiden: Brill, 2004), 47-69.

⁴⁸⁸ Corneliu C. Simuț, *Richard Hooker and His Early Doctrine*, 104.

⁴⁸⁹ Richard Hooker, *The Works of the Learned and Judicious Divine Mr. Richard Hooker with an Account of His Life and Death by Isaac Walton, edited by the Rev. John Keble*, vol. II (New York: D. Appleton & Company, 1844), 309, serm. 2. Par. 21.

Lee Gibbs, in his analysis of Hooker's *Discourse of Justification*, explains that for Hooker the gift of the indwelling Spirit includes righteousness of sanctification (faith, hope, and love) and the forensic righteousness of Christ by imputation *in tempore*, that is, "at one and the same time."⁴⁹⁰ Both of these gifts are understood to be an outgrowth of the believer's union with Christ.⁴⁹¹ With those who have ears to hear, the reverberation of this theological complex echoes backward in time, even before Peter Martyr in Switzerland or Oxford, to the theological salons of Naples, Viterbo, and Venice.

Although Vermigli never uses the nomenclature of *duplex iustitia* to describe his doctrine of justification, it nevertheless serves as an accurate summary of his position; that is, assuming imputation is clearly designated as the formal cause. It must be noted however that because this designation was not always clearly explicated in theological discourse (i.e., the fundamental role of imputation in causing justification)⁴⁹² Vermigli regarded the *duplex iustitia* with suspicion and at some points he even criticized it. For instance, he writes in his *Genesis* commentary: "that [the *duplex iustitia*] view is wholly overthrown which says that we are justified by grace, yet in such a way that it attributes a role to works, since together with

⁴⁹⁰ Lee W. Gibbs, "Richard Hooker's *Via Media* Doctrine of Justification," *Harvard Theological Review* 74, no. 2 (1981): 219-220. This notion of *in tempore* is roughly analogous to Calvin's great *simul, Institutio*, 3.15.1. Quum ergo haec beneficia, nonnisi se ipsum erogando, fruenda nobis Dominus concedat, utrumque simul largitur: alterum nunquam sine altero, in Calvin, *Ioannis Calvini, magni theologi, Institutionum Christianae religionis libri quatuor*, 210.

⁴⁹¹ Corneliu C. Simuț, *The Doctrine of Salvation in the Sermons of Richard Hooker*, *Arbeiten zur Kirchengeschichte* 94 (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2005), 117-118. Edward Yarnold also describes Hooker as a proponent of *duplex iustitia*, emanating from Saint Paul's theology of Christological union. Yarnold, "Duplex iustitia," 204-223, esp. 222.

⁴⁹² Tony Lane, for example, analyses Contarini's *Epistola de Iustificazione* (a letter written from Regensburg on May 25, 1541 in which he defends his views against Messer Angelo, Cardinal Gonzaga's theological advisor) and concludes, "Because of the *duplex iustitia* and the double sense of justification, it follows that there is a double formal cause of justification: 'charitas et gratia Dei nobis inhaerens et iusticia Christi nobis donata et imputata' (29:1-4)." A. N. S. Lane, "Cardinal Contarini and Article 5 of the Regensburg Colloquy (1541)," in *Grenzgänge der Theologie*, ed. O. Meuffels & J. Bründl (Münster: Lit Verlag, 2004), 163-90 (179). Alister McGrath also illustrates this point in his historiography of Seripando's debate at Trent concerning the formal causes of the *duplex iustitia*. Alister E. McGrath, *ID*, 331-334. McGrath recognizes that the humanist orientation of Contarini was disinclined to emphasize scholastic distinctions such as causality; nevertheless, he acknowledges that as in Johann Gropper's doctrine, the ground of Contarini's doctrine of justification essentially combined an *iustitia inhaerens* with the *iustitia Christi*. *Ibid.*, 312-315.

faith they actually lead to justification. I show that this is false.”⁴⁹³ In this vein, Klaus Sturm is correct that Vermigli avoided the position “in order to categorically avoid relativising Christ's righteousness appropriated in faith, which God imputes for forgiveness of sins and to admit only one 'causa' for justification: the mercy of God.”⁴⁹⁴ In other words, Vermigli would not risk confusing his position with a variety of *duplex iustitia* which failed to clearly define the formal cause in terms of imputation. Nevertheless, with this formal cause properly designated, the doctrine of *duplex iustitia* is a helpful way to account for Martyr's inclusion of the Spirit's cultivation of actual righteousness in the broader conception of his doctrine of justification.

F. Conclusion

We have learned that the basic contours of Vermigli's doctrine of justification comprise the following elements. Recognizing that humanity after Adam's sin is under divine condemnation as a *massa perditionis*, Martyr looks through his “intensive Augustinianism” lens to confront the problem of “Pelagianism.” With this threat in view, he employs the judicial language of *forense* to underscore the legal nature of justification, that is, the way in which God considers elect sinners to be in a state of righteousness. This reckoning is entirely *extra nos* and is not responsible for effecting internal renewal; *imputatio* is employed to explain how exactly this occurs. Such imputation consists of two movements: the accounting of Christ's righteousness, and the non-imputation of one's sin, the benefits of which are forgiveness and eternal life. In a few places Martyr uses the language of “adoption” to capture the legal and relational aspects of this relationship.⁴⁹⁵ Any suggestion that justification is caused by works is regarded as entirely unscriptural.⁴⁹⁶

⁴⁹³ Vermigli, *Mosis Commentarii*, 61: “Quare illa opinio omnino evertitur, quae ita nos iustificari fide dicit, ut tamen operibus tribuat partem, quod scilicet una cum fide ad iustificandum concurrant.”

⁴⁹⁴ Sturm, *Die Theologie Peter Martyr*, 67-68. “Diese Auffassung lehnt Martyr ausdrücklich ab, um die im Glauben angeeignete Gerechtigkeit Christi, die Gott zur Sündenvergebung anrechnet, radikal vor der Relativeierung zu schützen und nur eine “causa” der Rechtfertigung, die Barmherzigkeit Gottes, zuzulassen.”

⁴⁹⁵ Vermigli, *Romanos* 1232 [139], 1259 [167], 1280 [187].

⁴⁹⁶ *Ibid.*, 1224 [131].

In addition to his emphasis on forensic imputation, Vermigli includes regeneration and sanctification in the broader confines of justification. He calls this broader vision “a different kind of justification,”⁴⁹⁷ insofar as it becomes part of the basis by which we are justified in the final judgment. In this sense, Vermigli maintains a form of *duplex iustificatio*.⁴⁹⁸ Too weak and imperfect to withstand the scrutiny of divine holiness on its own, these works are buttressed by the imputation of Christ’s righteousness and thereby made acceptable.⁴⁹⁹ Such works are pleasing to God,⁵⁰⁰ and, while they are never meritorious,⁵⁰¹ they are rewarded on the last day.⁵⁰² Furthermore, these works are an essential component of salvation. “And if these works are born of God then it is inevitable that they are justified *and regenerated* (emphasis added).”⁵⁰³ Martyr is careful to distinguish these works from their proper cause, namely forensic imputation.⁵⁰⁴ Works are the effect (or fruit) and imputation is the cause (or root).

Martyr writes:

And Christ would want everyone to understand that none except the just are received into the kingdom of heaven. Therefore, he considers these external works so that it might be clearly understood by them that righteousness is imputed to men by faith. For no one can be so ignorant as not to know there are two principles of these: one by which they exist, the other by which they are known.⁵⁰⁵

In making the above distinction, Martyr posits a doctrine of justification that is “*of works*” (works validate one’s initial justification) and, in the broader, secondary sense of the term, justification is also “*by works*” insofar as the future judgment necessitates the fruit of regeneration. This distinction will be valuable in chapter five when we compare the doctrines of Newman and Vermigli.

Faith is the instrument that appropriates twofold righteousness (*duplex iustitia*)—forensic imputation and that which is wrought by the Spirit. In the former case, it is simply

⁴⁹⁷ Vermigli, *Corinthios Commentarii*, 19 [147].

⁴⁹⁸ Ibid.; *Romanos*, 1182 [88].

⁴⁹⁹ Vermigli, *Corinthios Commentarii*, 19 [147].

⁵⁰⁰ Vermigli, *Romanos*, 1222-1223 [128-129], 1227-1228 [133-134], 1290-1291 [196-197].

⁵⁰¹ Ibid., 1194 [100].

⁵⁰² Ibid., 1288 [195].

⁵⁰³ Ibid., 1232 [139: “Quod si nati sunt ex Deo, necesse est, eos iustificatos, et regeneratos esse.”

⁵⁰⁴ Ibid., 1128 [135], 1235-1236 [142].

⁵⁰⁵ Ibid., 1228-1229 [135].

faith, while in the latter it is faith accompanied by the activity of the regenerated mind and volition. Such regeneration produces a habit of virtue (sanctification) in the course of a faithful life. In his *Romans* commentary, the enlivening work of the Spirit serves as the context for justification, while the same Spirit directly instigates sanctification. Martyr employs the notion of *habitus* to describe the human disposition that produces good works. Such a disposition is an “inward righteousness which is rooted in us, which we obtain and confirm by leading a continually upright life.”⁵⁰⁶

For Vermigli, one cannot properly address the cataclysmic crisis of original sin by limiting justification to the problem of guilt. In addition to the legal dimension, it is also necessary for salvation to engage the spiritual and moral consequences of Adam’s transgression. To Martyr’s thinking, one’s union with the crucified and resurrected Christ, which results in a living faith, meaningfully addresses each of these consequences by bringing together forensic justification, regeneration, and sanctification. In this way, Vermigli offers a holistic view of justification that seeks to account for the comprehensive nature of human sin.

Having examined Peter Martyr’s doctrine of justification in the context of his socio-religious milieu, our next chapter will transition into the life and times of the second figure with whom this thesis is concerned: John Henry Newman.

⁵⁰⁶ Ibid., 1299 [205]: “... sed de illa intrinseca nobis inhaerente, quam recte vivendo perpetuo acquirimus, et confirmamus.”

Chapter Three

Newman's Historical Background

A. The Study of John Henry Newman

In January of 1864, the Anglican novelist Charles Kingsley published an article charging that the Roman Catholic Church in general and John Henry Newman in particular had little regard for truth. Failing to obtain a retraction from Kingsley or so much as an apology, Newman composed seven pamphlets which he published from April 21 to June 2. Recognizing his opportunity to offer a public answer for his Catholic faith, Newman reprinted five of the seven articles in a single volume titled *Apologia Pro Vita Sua* (1864). While deficient of some personal details (such as the names of his parents), the *Apologia* gives an autobiographical account of Newman's theological pilgrimage. Imbued with a quality of prose and existential transparency, the *Apologia* quickly became a bestseller in Britain and remains one of the greatest religious autobiographies of all time along with Augustine's *Confessions*.

The *Apologia* was the first volume of what would eventually become a cottage industry of books dedicated to Newman's life.⁵⁰⁷ Shortly afterward, Ann Mozley arranged

⁵⁰⁷ The most significant general biographies on Newman fall into three basic categories: those that are dedicated to his life, others that emphasize his thought, and those that do an adequate job of explicating both. The major works that fall into the first category include: Maisie Ward, *Young Mr. Newman* (London: Sheed & Ward, 1948); Eleanor Ruggles, *Journey into Faith: the Anglican life of John Henry Newman*, 1st ed. (New York: W.W. Norton, 1948); Louis Bouyer, *Newman: sa vie, sa spiritualité* (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1952); Bouyer's work was translated into English in 1958 and recently reprinted by Ignatius Press by the same title, *Newman: His Life and Spirituality* (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 2011). David Newsome, *The Convert Cardinals: John Henry Newman and Henry Edward Manning* (London: John Murray, 1993); Peter M. Chisnall, *John Henry Cardinal Newman: A Man of Courage, Conflict and Conviction* (London: St Pauls Publishing, 2001); Edward Short, *Newman and His Contemporaries* (New York: T&T Clark, 2011). The second category, emphasizing Newman's thought include: Terrence Merrigan, "Numquam Minus Solus, Quam Cum Solus - Newman's First Conversion: Its Significance For His Life and Thought," *Downside Review* 103, no. 351 (1985); Charles Frederick Harrold, *John Henry Newman: An Expository and Critical Study of His Mind, Thought and Art* (London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1945); John Holloway, *The Victorian Sage: Studies in Argument* (London: Macmillan, 1953); Adrian J. Boekraad, *The Personal Conquest of Truth According to J. H. Newman* (Louvain: Nauwelaerts, 1955); Charles Stephen Dessain, *John Henry Newman*, (London: Nelson, 1966); Avery Cardinal Dulles, *John Henry Newman* (London: Continuum, 2011); I. T. Ker and Terrence Merrigan, *The Cambridge Companion to John Henry Newman* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009); Thomas L. Sheridan, *Newman on Justification: A Theological Biography* (New York: Alba House, 1967). Biographies that sufficiently grapple with life and thought include: Henri Bremond, *Newman : Essai de biographie psychologique* (Paris: Librairie

Newman's letters and correspondence for publication.⁵⁰⁸ The collection was eventually published in two volumes in 1890.⁵⁰⁹ In 1891, the year after John Henry's death, his brother, Francis Newman, scandalized English language readers with his *Contributions Chiefly to the Early History of the Late Cardinal Newman*.⁵¹⁰ It was an ugly screed, apparently intended to prove that John Henry was a thoroughgoing Papist long before his conversion in 1845. According to Robbins, it earned Francis a public rebuke. Six years later, when Francis himself died, an obituary in the *Athenaeum* referred to it as betraying "a theological unbrotherliness rarely met with in recent biography."⁵¹¹

It is outside of the purview of this study to survey the myriad of Newman biographies that have been written over the years. Our concern is to understand the historical development of Newman's doctrine of justification. Despite the modest number of monographs treating this aspect of Newman's thought, there are a few works that are especially helpful. The following overview will consider their particular contributions according to a three-fold taxonomy: Newman's treatment of Martin Luther, general historical development of Newman's doctrine of justification, and uncreated grace in the context of his *via media*.

Bloud & Cie, 1906). And translated into English by the title, *The Mystery of Newman*, trans. H.C. Corrance (London: Williams & Norgate, 1907); Wilfrid Ward, *The Life of John Henry Cardinal Newman: Based on His Private Journals and Correspondence* (London Longmans, Green, and Co, 1912); R. D. Middleton, *Newman at Oxford: His Religious Development* (London: Oxford University Press, 1950); Meriol Trevor, *Newman: The Pillar of the Cloud*, vol. 1 (London: Macmillan & Co., 1962); *Newman: Light in Winter*, vol. 2 (London: Macmillan & Co., 1962); William Robbins, *The Newman Brothers: An Essay in Comparative Intellectual Biography* (Cambridge Harvard University Press, 1966); Ian Ker, *John Henry Newman: A Biography* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1988), and an updated edition in 2009; Vincent Ferrer Blehl, *Pilgrim Journey: John Henry Newman 1801-1845* (London: Burns & Oates, 2001); Frank M. Turner, *John Henry Newman: The Challenge to Evangelical Religion* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2002). The centenary of Newman's death produced a handful of valuable volumes including David Brown, *Newman: A Man for Our Time* (London: S.P.C.K., 1990); Susan Foister, *Cardinal Newman 1801-90: A Centenary Exhibition* (London: National Portrait Gallery Publications, 1990); Ian Ker and Alan G. Hill, *Newman after a Hundred Years* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990).

⁵⁰⁸ The project started in 1884 before Mozley's first draft was presented to Newman in 1887.

⁵⁰⁹ Anne Mozley, editor, *Letters and Correspondence of John Henry Newman [to 1845]*, 2 volumes, London, 1890. Includes brief autobiography.

⁵¹⁰ Francis William Newman, *Contributions chiefly to the early history of the late Cardinal Newman: with comments* (London: K. Paul, Trench, 1891).

⁵¹¹ Robbins, *The Newman Brothers*, vii.

The relationship of Newman's doctrine of justification to that of Martin Luther has received considerable attention. In what is the most quoted and distilled expression of his grievance, Newman writes, "[Luther] found Christians in bondage to their works and observances; he released them by his doctrine of faith; and he left them in bondage to their feelings."⁵¹² In his chapter titled "Newman on Justification: An Evangelical Evaluation," Alister E. McGrath dismantles Newman's argument piece by piece before concluding that his "account of the doctrine of justification associated with Luther is seriously inaccurate, and at one point appears to demonstrate a standard of intellectual integrity which falls short of what one might have hoped to encounter."⁵¹³ McGrath's case, which he also makes in his *magnum opus*, *Iustitia Dei*, is convincing.⁵¹⁴ Equally forceful is Fr. Thomas L. Sheridan's article "Newman and Luther on Justification" in which he agrees with McGrath that Newman is rightly criticized for his "unfair portrayal of Luther's teaching," and demonstrates that Luther's own doctrine had much in common with the position that Newman was defending.⁵¹⁵ In a similar vein, John F. Perry applies this historiography to contemporary ecumenical dialogue by illustrating how badly wrong Newman got Luther, particularly in how Newman "deconstructed" a passage from Luther's *Commentary on Galatians*.⁵¹⁶ Also with an eye on modern ecumenism is the late Richard John Neuhaus's article, "Newman, Luther, and the Unity of Christians," which explains the far-reaching implications of Newman's ill-informed caricature of Luther upon subsequent generations of Catholics.⁵¹⁷ Other treatments include an article by Scott Murray which analyses doctrinal similarities and

⁵¹² John Henry Newman, *Jfc*, 340. The following citations from Newman's *Lectures* are from his Third Edition, unless indicated otherwise.

⁵¹³ Alister E. McGrath, "Newman on Justification: An Evangelical Anglican Evaluation" in *Newman and the Word*, ed. Terrence Merrigan and Ian Ker (Louvain: Peeters, 2000), 94.

⁵¹⁴ Alister E. McGrath, *ID*, 295-307.

⁵¹⁵ Thomas L. Sheridan, "Newman and Luther on Justification," *Journal of Ecumenical Studies* 38:2-3 (2001): 217. In the précis of his article, Sheridan concludes, "Newman wrongly attributed to Luther the idea that justification is by mere extrinsic imputation, and, while he correctly attributed Luther's insistence upon 'justification by faith alone' to the latter's rejection of any kind of human merit, he wrongly accused him of antinomianism" (217).

⁵¹⁶ John F. Perry, "Newman's Treatment of Luther in the Lectures on Justification," *Journal of Ecumenical Studies* (1999): 303-317.

⁵¹⁷ Richard John Neuhaus, "Newman, Luther, and the Unity of Christians" *Pro Ecclesia* 6, no. 3 (1997): 277-288.

differences of the two men according to various topics,⁵¹⁸ and a chapter by Joseph S. O'Leary examining Newman's treatment of Luther in the context of nineteenth century Britain.⁵¹⁹

Of the various works addressing the historical development of Newman's doctrine of justification, the single most important book is the "theological biography" by Thomas Sheridan S. J., *Newman on Justification*.⁵²⁰ Sheridan carefully traces Newman's thought on the subject in eight chapters, covering Newman's childhood to the year 1835. A ninth and final chapter, titled "Final Synthesis and Conclusion," brings readers to 1837 when Newman's lectures were delivered in St. Mary the Virgin's Adam de Brome Chapel, and eventually to 1838 when the *Lectures on Justification* were first published. Peter Toon has a useful chapter in his book, *Evangelical Theology 1833-1856*, dedicated to the doctrine of justification in which he explains the backlash against Newman's position from within the evangelical community.⁵²¹ Toon's work is a helpful contribution since his investigation is the only one of its kind. Less illuminating, by comparison, is his article "A Critical Review of John Henry Newman's Doctrine of Justification," which is more critical in its assessment of Newman than in its research.⁵²²

While the late Frank Turner's *John Henry Newman: the Challenge to Evangelical Religion* has been rightly criticized for its excessive speculation into Newman's psychology, its emphasis on Newman's relationship to Evangelicalism sheds light on the formation of his doctrine of justification.⁵²³ Ian Ker's biography has an extended section that puts Newman's doctrine on justification into its historical context explaining the sequence of events that

⁵¹⁸ Scott Murray, "Luther in Newman's *Lectures on Justification*," *Concordia Theological Quarterly* 54 (1990): 156-178.

⁵¹⁹ Joseph S. O'Leary, "Impeded Witness: Newman Against Luther on Justification," in *John Henry Newman: Reason, Rhetoric and Romanticism*, ed. David Nicholls and Fergus Kerr (Bristol: Bristol Press, 1991), 153-193.

⁵²⁰ This was based on his doctoral thesis from the Institut Catholique de Paris, titled *Newman and Justification: A Study in the Development of a Theology*, 1965.

⁵²¹ Peter Toon, *Evangelical Theology, 1833-1856: A Response to Tractarianism* (London: Marshall, Morgan and Scott, 1979).

⁵²² Peter Toon, "A Critical Review of John Henry Newman's Doctrine of Justification " *Churchman* 94, no. 4 (1980): 335-344.

⁵²³ Turner, *John Henry Newman*, 266-275.

surrounded its composition.⁵²⁴ Alister McGrath also provides a thoughtful overview in *Iustitia Dei*, where he surveys, defines, and critiques Newman's position, especially as it relates to the Caroline divines and the teaching of Luther.⁵²⁵

The Cambridge Companion to John Henry Newman, edited by Ian Ker and Terrence Merrigan, offers a general overview of Newman's thought, including a chapter on justification written by Thomas Sheridan.⁵²⁶ This may be the single most helpful distillation of Newman's doctrine of justification available in print. A valuable primer on Newman's life and thought by Avery Cardinal Dulles, titled *John Henry Newman*, includes a brief overview of Newman's position on justification.⁵²⁷ Similar in form and substance is Ian's Ker book, *Newman on Being a Christian*.⁵²⁸ Finally, there is Henry Chadwick's excellent chapter, "Lectures on Justification," which examines Newman's position in the context of the Oxford Movement and in the history of post-Reformation soteriology.⁵²⁹

The central importance of the category of *gratia increata* to Newman's doctrine of justification has also been a subject of some research. Charles Dessain, in his article, "Cardinal Newman and the Doctrine of Uncreated Grace," surveys Newman's pneumatology to see how it informed his *gratia uncreata*.⁵³⁰ Dessain acknowledges that "On becoming a Catholic. . . Newman wrote little on the subject of Uncreated Grace."⁵³¹ In a similar direction, José Morales's chapter, "Newman and the Problems of Justification," analyses the logic of Newman's position, questioning whether it is in fact sustainable.⁵³² Going further

⁵²⁴ Ian Ker, *John Henry Newman: A Biography* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), 149-157.

⁵²⁵ McGrath, *ID*, 295-307.

⁵²⁶ Thomas L. Sheridan, "Justification" in *The Cambridge Companion to John Henry Newman*, ed. Ian Ker and Terrence Merrigan (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009).

⁵²⁷ Dulles, *Newman*, 16-25.

⁵²⁸ Ian Ker, *Newman on Being a Christian* (Notre Dame, IN.: University of Notre Dame Press, 1990), 52-58.

⁵²⁹ Henry Chadwick, "The Lectures on Justification," in *Newman After a Hundred Years*, ed. Ian Ker (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990), 287-308.

⁵³⁰ Charles Stephen Dessain, "Cardinal Newman and the Doctrine of Uncreated Grace" *The Clergy Review* 47 (1962): 207-229; 269-288.

⁵³¹ *Ibid.*, 285.

⁵³² Jose Morales, "Newman and the Problems of Justification," in *Newman Today: Papers Presented at a Conference on John Henry Cardinal Newman*, ed. Stanley L. Jaki, The Proceedings of the Wethersfield Institute 1 (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1989), 143-164.

than Dessain, Morales argues that Newman jettisoned his *via media* on justification when he abandoned Anglicanism itself.⁵³³ In particular, Morales questions the accuracy of Newman's assertion from the Third Edition of the *Lectures* that, "Unless the Author held in substance in 1874 what he published in 1838, he would not at this time be reprinting what he wrote as an Anglican. . . ."⁵³⁴ Arguing from a sermon that Newman published in 1840, two years after his *Lectures*, Morales contends that Newman had by that point already moved away from locating the formal cause of justification in an uncreated grace in favor of an inherent deposit of righteousness.⁵³⁵ Against this view, Thomas Holtzen, building on his doctoral dissertation from Marquette,⁵³⁶ argues in his article, "Newman's 'Via Media' Theology of Justification," that Newman's position on justification remained intact as a consistent *via media* owing to his doctrine of divine indwelling by the Holy Spirit.⁵³⁷ Before examining Newman's *via media*, however, we will first consider the religious background in which it developed.

B. The World of John Henry Newman

"It was the best of times, it was the worst of times,"⁵³⁸ at least in the Church of England. Dickens's aphorism cogently describes the period of John Henry Newman's life on which the current chapter shall concentrate, from his birth to the writing of his *Lectures on the Doctrine of Justification* (1801-1838). Reasons for this tumult were legion. Social and political upheaval on the Continent, the growth of rationalism, the evolution of applied science, and evangelical renewal movements associated with Wesley and Whitfield gave rise to a climate of transition and reform. As a result, nineteenth century Great Britain manifested three distinct movements: revivalism within Anglican and nonconformist

⁵³³ In the next chapter we examine this argument and conclude that Morales is mostly correct.

⁵³⁴ Newman, *Jfc*, 9.

⁵³⁵ Morales, "Newman Today," 157. The particular sermon is "Righteousness, not of us, but in us," in John Henry Newman, *Parochial and Plain Sermons* (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1997), 1041-1049, hereafter *PMI*.

⁵³⁶ Thomas L. Holtzen, "Union with God and the Holy Sprit: A New Paradigm of Justification" (Ph.D. Diss., Marquette University, 2002).

⁵³⁷ Thomas L. Holtzen, "Newman's 'Via Media' Theology of Justification " *Newman Studies Journal* 4, no. 2 (2007): 64-74.

⁵³⁸ Charles Dickens, *A Tale of Two Cities* (London: James Nisbet & Co., 1902), 3.

churches; a deeper commitment to ritualism in the same Anglican church; and, thirdly, it gave rise to a Latitudinarian (or Broad Church) form of Liberalism. In the first case, so called “Evangelicalism,” there was stimulated a groundswell of missionary activity and social reform; the second manifestation developed formal liturgy with sensational depth rooted in the early centuries of the church; and the last, an intellectually respectable morality devoid of doctrinal substance. Newman’s life intersected with each of these traditions, as we shall see.

John Henry Newman was born in London on Saturday February 21, 1801, the eldest of six children. His father, John Newman, was a banker and an easygoing member of the Church of England. John Henry’s mother, Jemina Foudrinier, was the daughter of a wealthy paper manufacturer who came from a French Protestant Huguenot background. The family lived at 80 Old Broad Street for two years before they moved to 17 Southampton Street, Bloomsbury. Decades later, Newman would recollect these childhood years as the starting point of his religious imagination.⁵³⁹

Newman’s religious background has been described as “a conventional, non-sacramental middle-class one.”⁵⁴⁰ Before long, however, he was awoken from his religious slumber by reading the Deist Thomas Paine and the skeptic David Hume.⁵⁴¹ Such reflection eventually led to his conversion to a sort of Evangelicalism that was “Calvinistic in character.”⁵⁴² This occurred in the autumn of 1816 when Newman was fifteen.⁵⁴³ Before analyzing the details of his conversion, the following section will briefly consider the larger Evangelical movement in which it occurred.

In the “Introductory Essay” of her work, *The Evangelical and Oxford Movements*, Elisabeth Jay explains why nineteenth century Evangelicalism has resisted clean-cut

⁵³⁹ Newman, *Apo*, 2.

⁵⁴⁰ Sheridan Gilley, “Life and Writings,” in *The Cambridge Companion to John Henry Newman*, ed. Ian Ker and Terrance Merrigan (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), 1.

⁵⁴¹ Newman, *Apo*, 3.

⁵⁴² John Henry Newman, *AW*, ed. Henry Tristram (London Sheed and Ward, 1956), 29. For Newman the term “Calvinist” had few of the precise doctrinal elements that are common to continental Calvinism. The meaning for Newman comes into sharper focus by looking at the teaching of evangelicals such as Thomas Scott, namely, the severity of sin, authority of Scripture, sufficiency of the cross, centrality of the new birth, power of the preached word, and necessity of holiness (Sheridan, *Newman on Justification*, 16).

⁵⁴³ Newman, *Apo*, 4.

definition. She suggests that it is largely due to its revivalist origins where elements of doctrine, piety, and organization were shaped by a wide array of personalities.⁵⁴⁴

Accordingly, Jay writes, “The nickname ‘Evangelical’ was acquired by these men because of the zeal they showed in spreading the Evangel or Gospel.”⁵⁴⁵ As David Bebbington,⁵⁴⁶ David Newsome,⁵⁴⁷ and Sheridan Gilley⁵⁴⁸ have argued, the particular leader and circumstances surrounding him or her effectively broadened the semantic range of the Evangelical label.⁵⁴⁹ The following sampling of figures and contributions is simply intended to offer a sense of its general complexion and portray the general contours of the tradition in which Newman’s doctrine of justification initially took shape. Such background will also help us to identify the factors that drove Newman’s reflection on justification into the *via media* and eventually into his *via Romana*.

According to Kenneth Latourette, “Taken as a whole, in 1815 [the year preceding Newman’s conversion] the Church of England was far from healthy. It was rich in its endowments and its revenues, but it was closely bound to the existing order and its leaders were fearful of any change that would jeopardize their position.”⁵⁵⁰ But not all Englishmen were so tentative. In reaction to the ecclesial *status quo*, a variety of dynamic movements emerged which resided in and extended beyond the Church of England, Church of Scotland, and a host of Dissenting organizations. Despite differences of style and emphasis, these groups shared a common identity typically described by the term “evangelical.”

⁵⁴⁴ Elisabeth Jay, *The Evangelical and Oxford Movements* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983), 1-19.

⁵⁴⁵ Ibid., 3.

⁵⁴⁶ D. W. Bebbington, *Evangelicalism in Modern Britain: A History from the 1730s to the 1980s* (London: Unwin Hyman, 1989), 1-19.

⁵⁴⁷ David Newsome, *The Parting of Friends: The Wilberforces and Henry Manning* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1966), 1-16.

⁵⁴⁸ Sheridan Gilley, *Newman and His Age* (Westminster: Christian Classics, 1991), 47-53.

⁵⁴⁹ David Bebbington has summarized evangelical religion in terms of his so called “quadrilateral”: conversionism, activism, biblicism, crucicentrism. David Newsome and Sheridan Gilley identify common evangelical traits such as denominational secessions, biblical literalism, chiliasm, and social justice (Newsome, *The Parting*; Gilley, *Newman*). Elisabeth Jay distinguishes between “essential” and “non-essential” features in her work, *The Religion of the Heart: Anglican Evangelicalism and the Nineteenth-Century Novel* (Oxford: Clarendon Press 1979), 51-105.

⁵⁵⁰ Kenneth Scott Latourette, *A History of Christianity*, Rev. ed., vol. II A.D. 1500-A.D. 1975 (San Francisco: Harper San Francisco, 1975), 1164.

Recognition of Evangelicalism's aims and concerns requires one to consider the previous century when the Wesleyan revivals brought an increased emphasis on personal faith to the working class of Britain. It was later, toward the end of the eighteenth century, when the upper class and segments of the established church were also affected by renewal. This was especially so between the years 1790-1830 when a "Calvinistic" brand of Evangelicalism acquired a significant following (often linked to Wesley's former colleague, George Whitfield). As the years passed, it was common for High Churchmen to condescendingly blame Calvinist evangelicals for what they perceived as excesses in religion.⁵⁵¹

Over against the "high-and-dry" church (Newman's favorite label for liberal clerics) and their followers,⁵⁵² early evangelicals distinguished themselves with terrific stories of conversion. One such example is John Newton (1725-1807), the slave trader turned minister and hymn writer who penned "Amazing Grace" and "How Sweet the Name of Jesus Sounds."⁵⁵³ Newton eventually became a spiritual leader who influenced many others, including William Cowper (1731-1800)⁵⁵⁴ and Thomas Scott (1747-1821).⁵⁵⁵ As Newton's successor, Scott's books were best sellers among evangelicals, particularly *A Commentary on the Whole Bible* and *The Force of Truth* (1779). As we shall see, he was also the figure to whom Newman attributed the greatest amount of credit for his conversion. In Newman's words, "It was he who first planted deep in my mind the fundamental truth of religion" and "who made a deeper impression on my mind than any other, and to whom (humanly speaking) I almost owe my soul."⁵⁵⁶

Space will not permit a treatment of the many individuals who contributed to Evangelicalism's impact. Some were scholarly such as Isaac Milner (1750-1820) and Charles

⁵⁵¹ Josef Lewis Altholz, "The Mind and art of Victorian Orthodoxy: Anglican Responses to 'Essays and Reviews,' 1860-1864," *Church History* 51 (1982): 187.

⁵⁵² Ker, *John Henry Newman*, 92.

⁵⁵³ John Newton and Richard Cecil, *Out of the Depths, being the autobiography of John Newton*, 2nd ed. (London: C. J. Thynne & Jarvis, 1925).

⁵⁵⁴ Also a hymn writer, William Cowper is perhaps most noted for the poem "Light Shining out of Darkness" (from which the English language gets the idiom "God moves in a mysterious way") and the enormously popular hymn of that day, "There is a Fountain Filled with Blood." Marion Harland, *William Cowper* (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1899).

⁵⁵⁵ Thomas Scott, *The Works of the Late Rev. Thomas Scott*, ed. John Scott (London: Thames Ditton, 1823).

⁵⁵⁶ Newman, *Apo*, 5.

Simeon (1759-1836), whose work infused Cambridge University with an evangelical awareness. The so-called Clapham Sect, consisting of wealthy individuals including John Venn (1759-1833), Henry Thornton (1760-1815), and William Wilberforce (1759-1833), engaged the enterprise of social reform, eventually effecting the emancipation of slavery in the British Empire. In a similar vein was the prison reformer, John H. Howard (1726-1790), and the Seventh Earl of Shaftesbury, Anthony Ashley Cooper (1801-1885), who tirelessly served the poor and oppressed. Evangelicals created their own publications such as the *Christian Observer*, *The Christian Guardian*, and the *Record*.⁵⁵⁷ They also spawned a host of missionary societies, starting most notably with the Baptists in 1792.⁵⁵⁸ The famous Sunday school movement, initiated by Hannah More (1745-1833) and popularized by Robert Raikes (1735-1811), is also part of the evangelical legacy. The list of contributions is long.⁵⁵⁹ Despite its varied and complex shape, such evangelicals shared a common identity, the nature of which we will now consider.

According to the evangelical Bishop of Liverpool, J.C. Ryle, it was “no written creed, no formal declaration of principles” that defined “Evangelical Religion.”⁵⁶⁰ With reference to evangelical leaders who preceded him, particularly to those of the late eighteenth century,⁵⁶¹ Ryle enumerates five values that properly identify the movement.⁵⁶²

⁵⁵⁷ For a history on each of these publications, see Toon, *Evangelical Theology*, 6-9.

⁵⁵⁸ Stephen Neill, *A History of Christian Missions*, 2 ed. (Middlesex Harmondsworth, 1986), 213-216.

⁵⁵⁹ John Henry Overton, *The Evangelical Revival in the Eighteenth Century* (London: Longmans, Green, 1886); J. C. Ryle, *Knots untied being plain statements on disputed points in religion from the standpoint of an evangelical churchman* (London: National Protestant Church Union, 1898); H. C. G. Moule, *The Evangelical School in the Church of England: Its Men and Its Work in the Nineteenth Century* (London: J. Nisbet & Co., 1901); William Law Mathieson, *England in Transition, 1789-1832, a Study of Movements* (London: Longmans, Green, and Co, 1920); *English Church Reform 1815-1840* (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1923); Charles Smyth, *Simeon & Church Order: A Study of the Origins of the Evangelical Revival in Cambridge in the Eighteenth Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1940); J. S. Reynolds, *The Evangelicals at Oxford, 1735-1871: A Record of an Unchronicled Movement with the Record Extended to 1905* (Oxford: Marcham Manor Press, 1975); Toon, *Evangelical Theology*; Jay, *The Evangelical and Oxford Movements*; Bebbington, *Evangelicalism*.

⁵⁶⁰ Ryle, *Knots untied*, 3.

⁵⁶¹ Ryle doesn't identify these individuals by name. Despite the “low church” origins of the movement, with its emphasis on Scripture only, priesthood of believers, and a general chilliness toward religious “tradition,” Ryle conveys his indebtedness to “the Thirty-nine Articles, the Prayer-book fairly interpreted, the works of the Reformers, [and] the writings of the pre-Caroline divines” (v).

1. Absolute supremacy of Holy Scripture
2. Appreciating the depth and prominence of human sinfulness
3. Paramount importance assigned to the work and office of the Lord Jesus Christ.
4. The inward work of God's Spirit in the heart of man
5. Outward and visible work of the Holy Ghost

The English biographer, memoirist and liberal politician, George W. E. Russell, offers a similar portrait. While he was a high churchman, Russell recollected his childhood experience of Evangelicalism, noting in particular how the religion of his youth generally divided humanity into two categories: the "converted" ones, who had "closed with the offer" (and were thus assured of their salvation), and those of "an unconverted character."⁵⁶³ The distinguishing characteristic of the first category, the "real" Christian, according to evangelical parlance, was one's heartfelt response to the gospel message. In Russell's words, "[I]f only we would accept the offer of salvation so made, we were forgiven, reconciled, and safe. The acceptance was 'Conversion.'"⁵⁶⁴ This distinction between the converted and unconverted was part of what drew Newman into Evangelicalism, and, as we shall see, it eventually repelled him.

C. Newman the Calvinist

Newman experienced the first religious conversion between August and December of 1816. A few months earlier, in March, his father's bank stopped payment in the aftermath of the Napoleonic wars. Meanwhile, alone at Ealing school and shocked by the financial catastrophe afflicting his family, John Henry became ill.⁵⁶⁵ This condition led to Newman's spiritual renewal under the influence of his schoolmaster, the Rev. Walter Mayers, who himself had recently converted to a Calvinistic variety of Evangelicalism. Mayers quickly became Newman's guide. This was mainly so through the books that Mayers offered, which, according to Newman, were

⁵⁶² Ryle, *Knots untied*, 4-9.

⁵⁶³ George William Erskine Russell, *The household of faith : portraits and essays* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1902), 240.

⁵⁶⁴ *Ibid.*

⁵⁶⁵ This was the first of three serious illnesses which were accompanied by a profound spiritual crisis. Newman writes, "The first keen, terrible one, when I was a boy of 15, and it made me a Christian—with experiences before and after, awful and known only to God" (Newman, *AW*, 150).

“the human means of this beginning of divine faith in me” and “all of the school of Calvin.”⁵⁶⁶

It is important to note that while Newman’s faith would change considerably over his lifetime, he never repudiated this conversion.⁵⁶⁷

Of the various authors whom Mayers recommended to Newman, the most significant was Thomas Scott of Aston Sandford, John Newton’s successor. In addition to appreciating Scott’s doctrine and independence of mind, Newman valued his commitment to holiness:

Besides his unworldliness, what I also admired in Scott was his resolute opposition to antinomianism, and the minutely practical character of his writings. They show him to be a true Englishman, and I deeply felt his influence; and for years I used almost as proverbs what I considered to be the scope and issue of his doctrine, “Holiness rather than peace,” and “Growth the only evidence of life.”⁵⁶⁸

Scott’s emphasis on the holiness of the Triune God remained with Newman in perpetuity as did his sober awareness of the problem of sin.⁵⁶⁹ On the matter of sin, Sheridan suggests that Scott was less than true to his Calvinist heritage by emphasizing personal transgression over the notion of total depravity.⁵⁷⁰ This is questionable. Sheridan is correct that Scott was serious about the acuity of personal transgression. It is certainly the light in which Newman himself presents Scott when he writes, “All they whom God justifies, says Mr. Scott, are *considered as ungodly*” in view of their flawed attempts at piety.⁵⁷¹ A contrast, however, between original and personal sin which lays stress upon the latter is hard to square with Scott’s volume, *Remarks on the refutation of Calvinism*, where he is very much in step with Calvin, especially in his first chapter titled “On Original Sin and the total Depravity of Human Nature.”⁵⁷² Thus, if we were to identify two main pillars of Scott’s creed, it would be the

⁵⁶⁶ Newman, *Apo*, 5.

⁵⁶⁷ Ibid.

⁵⁶⁸ Ibid.

⁵⁶⁹ An especially distilled treatment of Scott’s Trinitarian position is found in “The Personality and Deity of the Holy Spirit; with some thoughts on the doctrine of the sacred Trinity” in Thomas Scott, *Essays on the most important subjects in religion*, Fourth ed. (London: D. Jaques, Lower Sloane-Street, 1800), 243-260.

⁵⁷⁰ Sheridan, *Newman on Justification*, 28.

⁵⁷¹ Newman, *Jfc*, 115.

⁵⁷² Thomas Scott, *Remarks on the refutation of calvinism*, Second Edition (London: A. Macintosh 1817), 1-51.

holiness of the Triune God juxtaposed by the utter depravity of human nature. This couplet will prove to be especially important to Newman's doctrine of justification.

During this period, Newman also read Thomas Newton's *Dissertations on the Prophecies* (1754),⁵⁷³ a work that persuaded him that the Pope is the antichrist predicted in Scripture. Of more significance for the substance of Newman's thought was Joseph Milner's *History of the Church of Christ* (1794), about which Newman was "nothing short of enamoured of the long extracts from St. Augustine, St. Ambrose, and the other Fathers which I found there."⁵⁷⁴ Then in 1817 Walter Mayers gave Newman a copy of Bishop William Beveridge's *Private Thoughts*.⁵⁷⁵

In a letter thanking Mayers for Beveridge's volume, Newman conveys confusion over a particular issue that he had read therein. The problem concerned the fate of infants who died apart from baptism. If, as evangelicals such as Beveridge suggest, conversion is a conscious decision, therefore ruling out the efficacy of baptismal regeneration, on what basis can infants lay claim to Christian hope?⁵⁷⁶ Here is how Newman put the question to Mayers:

There is a passage in the first chapter of the second part [of Beveridge] that I don't quite comprehend: it is on the Sacrament of Baptism. I had, before I read it, debated with myself how it could be that baptized infants, dying in their infancy, could be saved unless the Spirit of God was given them; which seems to contradict the opinion that Baptism is not accompanied by the Holy Ghost. Bp Beveridge's opinion seems to be that the seeds of grace are sown in Baptism although they often do not spring up; that Baptism is the mean whereby we receive the Holy Spirit, although not

⁵⁷³ Bishop Thomas Newton, *Dissertations on the prophecies, which have remarkably been fulfilled, and at this time are fulfilling in the world* (London: J. and R. Tonson and Draper, 1754).

⁵⁷⁴ Joseph Milner, *The History of the Church of Christ* (London: J. and J. Merrill, 1794), 7. Milner's work presents a Calvinistic view in which the world is divided between the elect who are conscious of their justification by faith and the rest who are not.

⁵⁷⁵ William Beveridge, *Private thoughts upon religion digested into twelve articles, with practical resolutions form'd thereupon* (London: R. Smith, 1709).

⁵⁷⁶ The denial of baptismal regeneration was a touchstone of Evangelical orthodoxy, especially after the publication of Richard Mant's *Appeal to the Gospel* in 1812, in which he repudiated the evangelical's missionary push for conversion in favor of an ecclesiology based upon baptismal regeneration. Richard Mant, *An appeal to the Gospel, or An inquiry into the justice of the charge, alleged by Methodists and other objectors, that the Gospel is not preached by the national clergy* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1812).

the only mean; that infants, when baptized, receive the inward and spiritual grace without the requisite repentance and faith.⁵⁷⁷

Thomas Sheridan, in his book, *Newman on Justification*, analyses Walter Mayers' answer to Newman from a letter dated April 14, 1817 and concludes that Mayers, like Beveridge, is comfortable affirming that regeneration may *possibly* be communicated in baptism, but not necessarily, as evidenced by the many "Christians" who are members of the visible church without actually belonging to the invisible church.⁵⁷⁸ In keeping with the evangelical tendency to assess who is of the "real" church, regeneration (or "conversion" or "new life in Christ") can only be known by observing the "fruit of maturer years."⁵⁷⁹ This answer seemed to have satisfied Newman since it wasn't until September 29, 1820 that the subject of baptismal regeneration once again arose in his writing.⁵⁸⁰

Newman's correspondence with Mayers anticipates many of the concerns that reemerge later in his life, particularly the question of Baptism's efficacy and its relationship to repentance and faith. Bound up in this question is the concern of Newman and his evangelical forebears to define the source of "real" Christian life, whether it is properly derived from the sacraments or by faith alone.

D. Newman Questions His Evangelical Assumptions

When Newman was elected a fellow at Oriel in April of 1822, he expected that his evangelical faith would be questioned.⁵⁸¹ He was right. After Richard Whately helped the "awkward and timid" John Henry crawl out of his introverted shell, his views were immediately challenged by the liberal atmosphere of the Oriel Common Room.⁵⁸² In the face of such scrutiny, the first piece of Newman's Calvinism to slip away was the doctrine of

⁵⁷⁷ Newman, *AW*, 152.

⁵⁷⁸ Sheridan, *Newman on Justification*, 38-42. According to Sheridan, the letter is found in the Archives of the Birmingham Oratory, Miscellaneous Letters (1816-1824), no. 2.

⁵⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, 40.

⁵⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, 42.

⁵⁸¹ Newman seemed to have anticipated this when he attributes his reticence to "the result of his Calvinistic beliefs." Newman, *AW*, 65-66.

⁵⁸² Newman, *Apo*, 11.

predestination.⁵⁸³ But this was just the beginning. The Noetic triumvirate of Thomas Arnold (1795-1842) Richard Whately (1787-1863) and Edward Hawkins (1789-1882) would impose sustained pressure for Newman to step back and reevaluate his religious assumptions.

Newman became a full fellow at Oriel on April 4, 1823, the same day as Edward Pusey and William Churton became probationer fellows. As Newman's relationship with Pusey grew, so did his estimation of his Christian faith. At first, Newman had regarded him as simply "moral."⁵⁸⁴ Shortly afterward, Newman expressed that he was impressed by Pusey's seriousness toward religion.⁵⁸⁵ Finally, Newman confidently exclaims, "That Pusey is Thine, O Lord, how can I doubt?"⁵⁸⁶ They spent much time together discussing religion, Newman contending for the doctrine of imputation, Pusey denying it, Newman "inclining to separate regeneration from baptism, he doubting its separation."⁵⁸⁷

Despite his anti-Calvinist colleagues, Newman held fast to his evangelical creed. Mayers, who remained a mentor (until his untimely death in 1828), persuaded Newman to take holy orders, and in 1824 he was ordained deacon (the following year he would be ordained to the priesthood). After being appointed curate of Saint Clement's, a working-class parish in east Oxford, Newman engaged pastoral work with great enthusiasm. It was in this context that Newman started to question a *sine qua non* of Evangelicalism: the distinction between "nominal" and "real" Christians.

The importance of this tenet among evangelicals ran deep. As Newsome explains:

Time and time again, Evangelicals would stress that there were two kinds of Christian—the *nominal* Christian and the "truly religious" or "real" Christian, a distinction which gained currency with the publication of Joseph Milner's *Church History*, which appeared in stages during the 1790's and the following decade, and with Wilberforce's own *Practical View*. While this distinction was soon recognized as stock Evangelical phraseology—and indeed its acceptance rapidly became a sort of party shibboleth."⁵⁸⁸

⁵⁸³ Ibid., 4.

⁵⁸⁴ Newman, *AW*, 190.

⁵⁸⁵ Ibid., 190-191.

⁵⁸⁶ Ibid., 75.

⁵⁸⁷ Ibid., 203.

⁵⁸⁸ Newsome, *The Parting of Friends*, 46.

The question of whether such a distinction is theologically and pastorally defensible asserted itself in the summer of 1824. With many of the Fellows away, Newman developed a closer relationship to Edward Hawkins, who advised the young protégé on his parochial duties, particularly on his preaching. Hawkins sharply criticized Newman's first sermon, which, by its evangelical denigration of baptismal regeneration, "divided the Christian world into two classes, the one all darkness, the other all light."⁵⁸⁹ According to Newman, Hawkins chided him by explaining:

Men are not either saints or sinners; but they are not so good as they should be, and better than they might be. . . Preachers should follow the example of St Paul; he did not divide his brethren into two, the converted and unconverted, but he addressed them all as 'in Christ'. . . and this, while he was rebuking them for irregularities and scandals which had occurred among them.⁵⁹⁰

To drive his point further, Hawkins gave Newman a copy of John Bird Sumner's *Apostolical Preaching*, which showed that Paul addressed the visible church as a collective body of Christians who categorically possessed the Holy Spirit (and not two distinct groups of converted and unconverted).⁵⁹¹ This work, coupled with an active routine of pastoral visitation, severely dented Newman's regard for the distinction between real and nominal Christians.⁵⁹² Working out this idea, especially in conversation with Edward Pusey, would eventually lead Newman to question his commitment to the doctrine of imputation.⁵⁹³ In his

⁵⁸⁹ Newman, *AW*, 77.

⁵⁹⁰ *Ibid.*, 65.

⁵⁹¹ John Bird Sumner, *Apostolical preaching considered, in an examination of St. Paul's Epistles* (London: J. Hatchard and Son, 1815). Newman studied the work of Sumner, who was the evangelical Bishop of Chester, early in his life before delving into his *Apostolical Preaching*. Later, after the writing of *Tract 90*, it was Sumner who was first to denounce the tract from the Episcopal bench for its deviation from justification by faith alone. Turner, *John Henry Newman*, 390-391.

⁵⁹² About this experience, Newman writes (about himself in the third person): "It was during these years of parochial duty that Mr. Newman underwent a great change in his religious opinions...." *AW*, 73. Later in his memoir, he explains that "the religion which he had received from John Newton and Thomas Scott would not work in a parish; that it is unreal; that this he had actually found as a fact, as Mr. Hawkins had told him beforehand; that Calvinism was not a key to the phenomena of human nature, as they occur in the world" (79).

⁵⁹³ *Ibid.*, 203.

own words, writing in January of 1825, “I think, I am not certain, I must give up the doctrine of imputed righteousness and that of regeneration apart from baptism.”⁵⁹⁴

While Hawkins reoriented John Henry’s thinking on baptismal regeneration and imputation, he had yet another far-reaching influence, namely his stress upon the necessity of sacred tradition alongside of Scripture.⁵⁹⁵ While ultimately unsatisfying to Newman from an Anglican point of view (his conversion to Catholicism turned on the Roman Church’s ability to account for sacred tradition),⁵⁹⁶ the tacit acceptance of tradition which started in 1825 was a critical departure from his evangelical background, as Newman himself explains:

He [Hawkins] lays down a proposition, self-evident as soon as stated, to those who have at all examined the structure of Scripture, viz that the sacred text was never intended to teach doctrine, but only to prove it, and that, if we would learn doctrine, we must have recourse to the formularies of the Church; for instance to the Catechism, and to the Creeds. He considers, that, after learning from them the doctrines of Christianity, the inquirer must verify them by Scripture.⁵⁹⁷

Newman’s commitment to tradition would eventually create a doctrinal impasse. To the extent that he studied the history of doctrine, he was confronted by the universal practice of infant baptism. Newman reasoned that if it is true that baptism constitutes the rite of initiation into Christ, and not simply the *visible* church, as evangelicals were inclined to see it, it would therefore be possible for infants to be regenerated. He was not ready to accept this conclusion yet. Instead he opted for the position of Beveridge and Mayers which viewed baptism as planting the seed of grace. But make no mistake about it; as Newman modified his views on regeneration and the authority of tradition, he pursued a new religious path.

⁵⁹⁴ Ibid.

⁵⁹⁵ Years later, Newman would refer to this as “the *quasi*-Catholic doctrine of Tradition.” Ibid., 78.

⁵⁹⁶ Growing out of his study of the Post Nicene Fathers, Newman grew uncertain about whether Anglicanism could be properly called “Catholic.” These doubts took root in 1839, when he read an article by Cardinal Nicholas Wiseman in the *Dublin Review* in which Anglicans were compared to African Donatists during the time of Augustine. Reflecting on this question over time, Newman began to correlate the Church of England with the heretical Arians of the fourth century. In Newman’s mind, Anglicanism failed the Catholic test. Newman tells this story in his *Apo*, 127-237.

⁵⁹⁷ Newman, *Apo*, 9.

E. “Shreds and Tatters” of Evangelicalism

In addition to Sumner’s *Apostolical Preaching*, Newman was also influenced by Joseph Butler’s *The Analogy of Religion* (1736).⁵⁹⁸ Above all, Butler’s work cast aspersions upon the chief tenets of Evangelicalism, portraying it as “an emotional religion [with which Newman] could have little sympathy.”⁵⁹⁹ It was in the context of describing this influence that Newman also explained that he “had taken the first step towards giving up the evangelical form of Christianity; however, for a long while certain shreds and tatters of that doctrine hung about his preaching. . . .”⁶⁰⁰

Recounting in his *Apologia* the factors most responsible for swaying him during this period, Newman highlights two. The first was his drift toward Liberalism in which he preferred intellectual excellence to moral.⁶⁰¹ This movement, however, was only short-lived on account of his emotional breakdown as an examiner of schools and the sudden death of his favorite Sister, Mary. The other factor was John Keble’s *Christian Year* (1827), which brought to mind principles that he had previously learned from Butler. The first of these principles is especially relevant to the question of regeneration: “[It] was what may be called, in a larger sense of the word, the Sacramental system, that is, the doctrine that material phenomena are both the types and the instruments of things unseen. . . .”⁶⁰² Newman goes on to explain that sacraments are not simply a sign directing the faithful to the mysteries of faith; they are also the *instrumental means* by which one encounters them.⁶⁰³

As Newman rejected Evangelicalism’s subjective criterion for church membership in favor of an objective sacramental assessment, there was a definite turning point in the development of his thought.⁶⁰⁴ Momentum was added to this trajectory in 1831, when,

⁵⁹⁸ Joseph Butler, *The analogy of religion, natural and revealed, to the constitution and course of nature* (London: John and Paul Knapton, 1736).

⁵⁹⁹ Newman, *AW*, 78.

⁶⁰⁰ *Ibid.* This step occurred shortly after his ordination to the priesthood on May 29, 1825.

⁶⁰¹ Newman, *Apo*, 14. Cf. Blehl, *Pilgrim Journey*, 77.

⁶⁰² Newman, *Apo*, 18. The second principle that Newman learned from Butler is “probability [in the service of faith and love] as the guide of life” (19).

⁶⁰³ *Ibid.*, 18.

⁶⁰⁴ *Ibid.*, 49. Newman’s sermon titled “Holiness Necessary for Future Blessedness” (preached in 1826) makes explicit his repudiation of the evangelical doctrine of sudden conversion: “It follows

having been relieved from his teaching duties, Newman accepted a commission to write a history of the church councils. It turned out that instead he wrote his first great work, *The Arians of the Fourth Century* (1833).⁶⁰⁵ Research for this volume strengthened Newman's conviction with regard to the two aforementioned topics: regeneration understood in the context of sacramental objectivity and the authority of the church institution.⁶⁰⁶ Ian Ker summarizes Newman's position on ecclesial authority after completing his study of the fourth century church:

Nor did the early Church use the Bible to teach the faith; it was the Church that taught what had to be believed, and it only appealed to 'Scripture in vindication of its own teaching'; heretics, on the other hand, like the Arians, relied on a 'private study of Holy Scripture' to elicit a 'systematic doctrine from the scattered notices of the truth which Scripture contains.' The parallel with the contemporary situation was obvious.⁶⁰⁷

Through this lens, Newman's reflection on baptismal regeneration led him to a heartened vision of the sacramental Church, but the realities on the ground vis-à-vis Liberalism and Evangelicalism were thoroughly disheartening. Frustration over this problem (and general fatigue from research and writing) ran so deep that Newman needed a vacation. Recognizing this, he decided to accompany the Froudes on a Mediterranean voyage.

It was in December of 1832 when Newman set sail from Falmouth with Richard Hurrell Froude and his father on a trip intended to enrich Richard's health. After visiting Corfu and then arriving to Rome in March 1833, Newman took great pleasure in the

at once, even though Scripture did not plainly tell us so that no one is able to prepare himself for heaven, that is, make himself holy in a short time; . . . there are others who suppose they may be saved all at once by a sudden and easily acquired faith." Newman, *PPS*, 10.

⁶⁰⁵ John Henry Newman, *The arians of the fourth century: their doctrine, temper, and conduct, chiefly as exhibited in the councils of the church, between A.D. 325, & A.D. 381* (London: C. J. G. & F. Rivington, 1833). For an assessment of Newman's work, see Rowan Williams, *Arius: Heresy and Tradition* (London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1987), 3-6, 147, 158.

⁶⁰⁶ It also introduced Newman to a third issue that would become important for his doctrine of justification—the Eastern notion of uncreated grace, which we will consider in due course. For a helpful explanation of how the fourth century fathers, particularly Athanasius, applied the idea of uncreated grace to the doctrine of salvation, see Ivan Popov, "The Idea of Deification in the Early Eastern Church," in *Theosis: Deification in Christian Theology*, ed. Vladimir Kharlamov (OR: Pickwick, 2011), 42-48.

⁶⁰⁷ Ker, *John Henry Newman*, 52.

beautiful sites.⁶⁰⁸ When the Froudes returned to England in April, Newman decided to revisit Sicily. It was there, terribly ill with gastric or typhoid fever, that Newman's thoughts went to the liberal threat facing the church in the wake of the Reform Bill of 1832,⁶⁰⁹ in light of which he wrote in his journal: "God has still work for me to do."⁶¹⁰ After returning home by sea where he wrote his famous poem "Lead Kindly Light," he finally arrived in Oxford on July 9, 1833.⁶¹¹ This was five days before Keble preached his assize sermon, later published as *National Apostasy*, which, in retrospect, Newman considered to be the beginning of the Oxford or Tractarian Movement.⁶¹² The stage was now set for Newman to articulate his "middle way" or *via media*.

F. The Making of Newman's *Via Media*

By the year 1833, Newman had acquired the raw materials with which he would construct his *via media*. This included certain theological convictions that remained with him from earlier years, namely a commitment to the holiness of the Triune God and recognition of human depravity.⁶¹³ These convictions, which he originally imbibed from his evangelical teachers such as Thomas Scott and Walter Mayers, would continue with Newman for the remainder of his life. You might say that the pursuit of holiness functioned as the engine that drove Newman's faith, and the doctrine of depravity was the governor that subdued his expectations for human achievement.

With the couplet of holiness and depravity in view, it is now time to examine the theological Rubicon that led to Newman's *via media*. It essentially consists of three

⁶⁰⁸ Newman, *Apo*, 32.

⁶⁰⁹ In the background of this legislation was the Catholic Relief Act of 1829, which reduced many of the restrictions on Roman Catholics. Newman and his contemporaries perceived this as a threat to the privileges of the Church of England.

⁶¹⁰ Newman, *AW*, 127.

⁶¹¹ Newman, *Apo*, 35.

⁶¹² Keble's sermon underscored the struggle for church identity in the face of government intervention, a theme that would remain central to the Tractarian movement. Geoffrey Rowell, *The Vision Glorious : Themes and Personalities of the Catholic Revival in Anglicanism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1983), 4.

⁶¹³ Michael Testa writes, "I have indicated that some Calvinistic tendencies remain with Newman throughout his life. One example is his profound sense of the sinfulness of humanity." *The Theological Anthropology of John Henry Newman* (Ph.D. Diss., St. Louis University, 1993).

elements, the first two of which we have mentioned already several times, namely, regeneration understood in the context of sacramental objectivity and the authority of the church institution. Before getting to the third element, let us be sure we are clear on how Newman arrived at the first two conclusions.

Newman's view of regeneration and tradition were a result of his study of the fourth century church fathers. With regard to regeneration, Newman consciously moved away from the evangelical distinction that understood it to be a subjective experience accessed by faith alone and displayed in virtuous fruit among "real" Christians. Instead, he embraced the objectivity of the sacraments where one encounters the "real" presence of Christ in baptism and the Lord's Supper. Then, with a new appreciation for ecclesial authority, he moved away from the doctrine of Scripture alone to a combination of Scripture and tradition under the aegis of an authoritative church institution. In this way, he sought to safeguard the doctrinal fidelity of the contemporary Church of England (against doctrinal innovators and undue subjectivity) by appropriating the beliefs and practices of the ancient church vis-à-vis oral tradition and the efficacy of sacramental mediation.⁶¹⁴

This development reflects a logic that inevitably led to the third element of Newman's Rubicon and to his *via media* on the doctrine of justification, namely, "uncreated grace" (*gratia increata*). Here is how it happened. By jettisoning the evangelical distinction between "real" and "nominal" faith based on one's membership in the invisible church (step one), by embracing the sacrament of baptism as the necessary instrument by which one is regenerated (step two), and by insisting that the visible church is coterminous with the Body of Christ (step three), Newman came to recognize the instrumental cause of justification in a way that was more consistent with the Roman Catholic position. If, at this time, Newman had converted to Catholicism, his course of action would have been simple—leave imputation and *sola fide* behind with Protestantism.⁶¹⁵ As an Anglican (obligated to the *Thirty-Nine Articles*), however, this was not an option. Article Eleven of the *Articles*, which

⁶¹⁴ Frederick H. Borsch explains how such an approach infused Tractarian spirituality with a measure of mysticism, often leading to an emphasis on the Eucharist. Frederick H. Borsch, "Ye Shall Be Holy: Reflections on the Spirituality of the Early Years of the Oxford Movement," *Anglican Theological Review* 66 (Oct., 1984): 356.

⁶¹⁵ This is of course precisely what Newman did in 1845 when was received into the Catholic Church by Fr. Dominic Barberi of the Passionist Order.

specifically defines justification by “Faith only,” would not permit it. He therefore faced a conundrum, or at least he would have faced one, if not for a lesson that Newman had learned from his study of the fourth century fathers—the doctrine of *gratia increata*.

The idea of grounding salvation in a form of *gratia increata* is the crowning development of Newman’s soteriological reflection, and the one that enabled him to finally develop his doctrine into a *via media* on justification. In keeping with the questions and concerns of the Alexandrian Fathers, especially Clement, Athanasius, and Cyril, whose writings he devoured,⁶¹⁶ and also the French patristic scholar, Dionysius Petavius S. J. (1583-1652, or Denis Pétau),⁶¹⁷ Newman increasingly emphasized the inadequacy of human reason in grasping the divine presence (contra Liberalism and Evangelicalism) in favor of sacramental mediation. At the center of this mediation was a mystical union with Christ,⁶¹⁸ in which, as Newman states, “true religion is in part altogether above reason, as in its Mysteries. . . .”⁶¹⁹

Newman came to recognize that by virtue of the church’s sacramental union with Christ, believers possess the gift of the Holy Spirit, a gift which “pervades us (if it may be so said) as light pervades a building, or as a sweet perfume the folds of some honourable robe; so that, in Scriptural language, we are said to be in Him, and He in us.”⁶²⁰ The implication of this union shaped Newman’s thinking about justification, as he continues: “It is plain that such an inhabitation brings the Christian into a state altogether new and marvelous, far above the possession of mere gifts. . . .”⁶²¹ This fit naturally with Newman’s growing regard for the Sacrament of Baptism, whereupon “each individual member receives the gift of the Holy Ghost as a preliminary step, a condition, or means of his being incorporated into the

⁶¹⁶ Brian E. Daley, “The Church Fathers,” in *The Cambridge Companion to John Henry Newman*, ed. Ian Ker and Terrance Merrigan (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), 31-41.

⁶¹⁷ Dessain, “Uncreated Grace,” 215.

⁶¹⁸ Charles Stephen Dessain, “Cardinal Newman and the Eastern Tradition,” *Downside Review* 94 (1976): 95.

⁶¹⁹ Newman, *PPS*, 242. This sermon was first published in 1835

⁶²⁰ *Ibid.*, 368. This sermon was first published in 1835.

⁶²¹ *Ibid.* This sermon was first published in 1835.

Church; or, in our Savior's words, that no one can enter, except he be regenerated in order to enter it."⁶²²

With the Alexandrian Fathers, Newman recognized the divine presence to include the Father and the Son, along with the Spirit.⁶²³ In his words, "[Divine presence is] described as God's presence or indwelling; sometimes that of Father and Son; sometimes the Holy Ghost; sometimes of Christ the Incarnate Mediator; sometimes of God through the Spirit. . . ."⁶²⁴ Joel Elowsky, quoting Cyril of Alexandria's explanation of this concept, illustrates the continuity of Newman's position with the fourth century Fathers: "When we thus receive the Spirit, we are 'proved sharers and partakers in the Divine Nature and we admit the Father himself into our hearts, through the Son and in the Son.'"⁶²⁵ In such an economy, the Father declares sinful man to be righteous, upon the merits and saving grace of Christ, by means of the inhabitation of the Holy Spirit.⁶²⁶

Michael Gorman, in his book, *Inhabiting the Cruciform God: Kenosis, Justification, and Theosis in Paul's Narrative Soteriology*,⁶²⁷ offers some insight into the distinctive features of Eastern theology that would have attracted Newman. In the opening pages, Gorman provides a Trinitarian definition of theosis with which Newman would have been most comfortable. He writes, "Theosis is transformative participation in the kenotic, cruciform character of God through the Spirit-enabled conformity to the incarnate, crucified, and resurrected/glorified Christ."⁶²⁸ As our next chapter will examine, the reason for Newman's resonance with this definition is largely indebted to the "Spirit-enabled conformity" in which justification is conceived of as a participatory and transformative experience closely tied to sanctification and holiness. In the words of his role model,

⁶²² Ibid., 655. This sermon was first published in 1836.

⁶²³ For a development of Newman's appreciation and usage of the Alexandrian Fathers see Benjamin John King, *Newman and the Alexandrian Fathers: Shaping Doctrine in Nineteenth-Century England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009).

⁶²⁴ Newman, *Jfc.*, 150 [167].

⁶²⁵ Joel Elowsky, "Bridging the Gap," in *Theosis: Deification in Christian Theology*, ed. Vladimir Kharlamov (OR: Pickwick, 2011), 153.

⁶²⁶ Newman, *Jfc.*, 147 [163-164].

⁶²⁷ Michael J. Gorman, *Inhabiting the Cruciform God: Kenosis, Justification, and Theosis in Paul's Narrative Soteriology* (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 2009).

⁶²⁸ Ibid., 7.

Thomas Scott, many of whose ideas Newman retained for the remainder of his life, ““Holiness rather than peace.”⁶²⁹

The main contribution of Dionysius Petavius to Newman’s doctrine was the Spirit’s substantial indwelling in the regenerate soul, a notion that Petavius helped to reintroduce among Catholic scholars in seventeenth century.⁶³⁰ With a Trinitarian synthesis similar to Newman’s, Petavius promoted the role of the Holy Spirit as the *gratia increata* of justification, that is, the formal cause upon which one is declared (and also made) to be righteous.⁶³¹ Expressing his approval in the Advertisement to the Third Edition (1874) Newman writes, “Moreover, Petavius speaks of another, or fifth [form of justification], viz. the substantial Presence of the Holy Ghost in the soul.”⁶³²

Our next chapter will examine more specifically how Newman constructed his doctrine with the resources of Eastern thought. The main idea to grasp at this point is the influence of such ideas upon Newman’s theological reflection. In keeping with the bent of Newman’s character, C. Stephen Dessain points out, “[Newman] could never have been satisfied with thinking of grace merely as a quality in the soul or a strengthening force or a refreshing water.”⁶³³ And as this was personally true for Newman, it also applied to the Oxford Movement in general, as Ralph Townsend comments, “The core idea of Tractarian spirituality is that we may become by grace what Christ is by nature; we are transfigured by the divine indwelling.”⁶³⁴

⁶²⁹ Newman, *Apo*, 5.

⁶³⁰ Henri Rondet, *The Grace of Christ: A Brief History of the Theology of Grace* (Westminster, MD.: Newman Press, 1967), 366-373.

⁶³¹ *ibid.*, 367.; Holtzen, "Union with God ", 35.; For an explanation of how Petavius used the Eastern Fathers, see King, *Newman and the Alexandrian Fathers*, 119-121.

⁶³² Newman, *Jfc*, xii. Mark Medley examines the relevance of theosis for contemporary reflection on the doctrine of justification in his essay, “Participation in God: The Appropriation of Theosis by Contemporary Baptist Theologians.” Medley provides an assessment of several modern Baptist theologians who, by applying the category of uncreated grace, have challenged concepts on justification that appear to reduce the doctrine to a legal-forensic activity. *Theosis: Deification in Christian Theology*, ed. Vladimir Kharlamov (OR: Pickwick, 2011), 207.

⁶³³ Dessain, "Uncreated Grace," 215.

⁶³⁴ Ralph Townsend, "The Catholic Revival in the Church of England," in *The Study of Spirituality*, ed. Cheslyn Jones (Oxford University Press, 1986), 465.

G. The Oxford or Tractarian Movement

After describing the conclusion of his Mediterranean journey, Newman opens chapter two of his *Apologia* with these words: “When I got home from abroad, I found that already a movement had commenced, in opposition to the specific danger which at that time was threatening the religion of the nation and its Church.”⁶³⁵ The dangerous threat to which Newman refers was a perceived attack by the new Whig administration (after nearly four decades of unbroken Tory rule) on structures and revenues of the Protestant Church of Ireland.⁶³⁶ Newman’s response, in collaboration with such figures as Edward Bouverie Pusey, John Keble, Richard Hurrell Froude, William Palmer, Robert Wilberforce, and Isaac Williams became the context in which his *via media* emerged. While a great deal can be said about very small parts of this narrative, to say nothing of the overall Oxford Movement, we will focus our attention on those elements that elucidate Newman’s doctrine of justification.⁶³⁷

Following Keble’s assize sermon, “National Apostasy,” from the pulpit of St. Mary’s on July 14, the Oxford Movement initiated its campaign in September of 1833 with brief articles titled *Tracts for the Times*. The Tracts had two primary targets: opposition of the “High and Dry” establishment which sought to promote the marriage of State and Church, and the Nonconformist Churches which, consisting largely of evangelicals, had grown in membership throughout Britain. Of these two targets, Liberalism initially occupied the

⁶³⁵ Newman, *Apo*, 36.

⁶³⁶ The Irish Church Temporalities Bill 1833 was the immediate occasion for Newman’s reaction. Herein lies a fascinating paradox: the Oxford Movement’s defense of an aggressively Protestant Irish Church against Catholic adversaries who sought to reduce its power eventually resulted in much of the movement crossing the Tiber into Catholicism.

⁶³⁷ Helpful works on the Oxford Movement include: Yngve Brilioth, *The Anglican Revival: Studies in the Oxford Movement* (London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1925); Owen Chadwick, *The Mind of the Oxford Movement* (London: A. & C. Black, 1960); Owen Chadwick, *The Spirit of the Oxford Movement: Tractarian Essays* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990); Richard William Church, *The Oxford Movement: Twelve Years, 1833-1845*, 3rd. ed. (London: Macmillan, 1892); G. V. Cox, *Recollections of Oxford* (London: Macmillan, 1868); Christopher Dawson, *The Spirit of the Oxford Movement* (London: Sheed & Ward, 1933); Rodney Stenning Edgecombe, *Two Poets of the Oxford Movement: John Keble and John Henry Newman* (London: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 1996); G. C. Faber, *Oxford Apostles: A Character Study of the Oxford Movement* (London: Faber and Faber, 1933); Thomas Mozley, *Reminiscences: Chiefly of Oriel College and the Oxford Movement*, 2nd ed. (London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1882); Peter Benedict Nockles, *The Oxford movement in Context: Anglican High Churchmanship, 1760-1857* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994).

foreground. So involved in the project did Newman become that he would eventually edit, publish, or contribute to thirty of the ninety *Tracts*. Like Athanasius of old, Newman regarded himself as taking a stand against heresy—the liberal heresy of Erastianism and the subjective heresy of evangelicals.⁶³⁸

Of all the criticisms leveled against the *Tracts*, the most common was its agenda to undermine the Protestant character of the Church of England. John Bowden, for example, had warned Newman in a letter dated July 14 1834, that the Oxford Tracts “will be one day charged with rank Popery,” and recommended that a tract be published to preempt the charge.⁶³⁹ In response to this critique, Newman composed two tracts (numbers 38 and 41) suggesting that the Church of England had become more Protestant than it had previously been. The proper trajectory of Anglicanism, argued Newman, is a *via media* between Protestantism and the Roman Catholic Church.⁶⁴⁰ His argument came to a head in 1837 with his *Lectures on the Prophetical Office of the Church* (first published on March 11, 1837), a work that systematized the teaching of Anglican Divines of the seventeenth century, originally delivered in Adam de Brome chapel of St. Mary’s Church.⁶⁴¹

The foundation of Newman’s *via media* distinguished the so called “episcopal tradition,” which grew out of the Catholic creeds and was passed through generations by a succession of bishops, from the “prophetical tradition,” which was thought to exist in the

⁶³⁸ Dulles, *Newman*, 5. Newman narrates his role in the movement up to his eventual disenchantment with the *via media* in his *Apo*, 101-146.

⁶³⁹ John Henry Newman, *Letters and Diaries of John Henry Newman* ed. Charles Stephen Dessain *et al.* Vol. 4 (London: T. Nelson, 1961-1977), 304.

⁶⁴⁰ Unlike other expressions of Anglo-Catholicism, which borrowed wholesale from the Roman Catholic Church, the Tractarians were more cautious in such identification. W. S. F. Pickering, *Anglo-Catholicism: A Study in Religious Ambiguity* (London: Routledge, 1989), 41.

⁶⁴¹ John Henry Newman, *Lectures on the prophetical office of the church: viewed relatively to Romanism and popular Protestantism*, 2 ed. (London: C. J. G. & F. Rivington, 1838). In December of 1876, Newman organized this work into a two-volume set titled *The Via Media*. The first volume consisted of the third edition of the *Lectures on the Prophetical Office of the Church*. The second volume comprised eleven more occasional pieces including his tracts on the Church Missionary Society of 1830, documentation of Tract 90, and his retraction of anti-Catholic statements in 1841. Newman wrote a new preface, which serves as his last word on the concept of an Anglican *via media*. John Henry Newman, *The Via Media of the Anglican Church* (London: Pickering, 1877).

broader development of the Church's theological reflection.⁶⁴² In his *Lectures on the Prophetical Office*, Newman emphasizes the vital necessity of this prophetical tradition. In addition to drawing attention to the growth and development of Christian teaching beyond the primitive creeds, this emphasis also had the effect of moving the range and scope of apostolic faith closer to Roman Catholicism. Statements such as the following illustrate how Newman's logic drove him in this direction:

What is meant by the Church Catholic at this day? Where is she? What are her local instruments and organs? how does she speak? when and where does she teach, forbid, command, censure? how can she be said to utter one and the same doctrine every where, when we are at war with all the rest of Christendom, and not at peace at home? In the Primitive Church there was no difficulty, and no mistaking; then all Christians every where spoke one and the same doctrine, and if any novelty arose, it was at once denounced and stifled. The case is the same, indeed, with the Roman Church now; but for Anglo-catholics so to speak, is to use words without meaning, to dream of a state of things long past away from this Protestant land.⁶⁴³

It is noteworthy that in this second edition of the *Lectures* (1838), following the above logic, Newman renamed "Anglicanism" "Anglo-Catholicism." In this trajectory, Newman and his fellow Tractarians contended that it was necessary to look back before the sixteenth century context of Cranmer, Latimer, and Ridley in appreciation of the Catholic scope of the early church.⁶⁴⁴ With such a vision, Newman sought to strengthen the church to withstand the dangers of the moment by inculcating an informed commitment to "Apostolical Succession" and "the Liturgy."⁶⁴⁵ The primary vehicles of communication driving this campaign were diverse. In addition to the *Lectures on the Prophetical Office*, print media included the *Tracts for the Times*,⁶⁴⁶ Froude's *Remains*,⁶⁴⁷ and the *British Critic*, a paper with a circulation of

⁶⁴² Newman, *Lectures on the prophetical office*, 304-313. In Newman's thought, these generally corresponded to the *lex credendi* (the episcopal tradition's dogmatic formulations) and the *lex orandi* (the prophetical tradition's development of doctrine).

⁶⁴³ *Ibid.*, 317-318.

⁶⁴⁴ Newman's infamous opposition of the construction of the Martyr's Memorial, the broad contours of which are helpfully outlined by Ian Ker, bears eloquent testimony to this fact. Ker, *John Henry Newman*, 172-173.

⁶⁴⁵ Sheridan, *Newman on Justification*, 214.

⁶⁴⁶ The *Tracts* defined their positions over against Nonconformist Churches (which Tractarians categorically rejected since they lacked bishops and were therefore considered to be illegitimate) and the Erastian elements of the Established Church (which were thought to undermine

approximately 1,200 which Newman himself edited starting in 1838.⁶⁴⁸ Other platforms included the pulpit of Saint Mary's Church where Newman preached weekly⁶⁴⁹ and the Adam De Brome chapel where he lectured.⁶⁵⁰

The question naturally arises, to what was Newman reacting when he formed his *via media*? Thomas Sheridan, arguing from Newman's *Apologia* (1864), asserts that it was primarily the threat of Liberalism, such that in *The Arians of the Fourth Century*, "Newman could not help but compare in his own mind the Church of which he was reading in the writings of the fourth century Fathers and the Church as he knew it in the England of his day."⁶⁵¹ Sheridan is not alone in recognizing this tendency. Rowan Williams, in his volume on Arius, makes a similar point; Williams, however, also highlights the role of Evangelicalism in provoking Newman's polemic. His argument illuminates the connection between Newman's writing of *The Arians*, the Oxford Movement, and Newman's growing critique of Protestantism:

However, setting aside for the moment the distasteful rhetoric of [Newman's] exposition, it should be possible to see something of what his polemical agenda really is. *The Arians of the Fourth Century* is, in large part, a tract in defence of what the early Oxford Movement thought of as spiritual religion and spiritual authority. It works with a clear normative definition of Christian faith and practice, in which ascetical discipline goes hand-in-hand with the repudiation of Protestant biblicism (and Protestant rejection of post-scriptural development in teaching and devotion). .

the supernatural character of Christ's Body). With the accession of Edward Pusey in late 1833, the *Tracts* acquired a greater degree of thoroughness.

⁶⁴⁷ Edited by Newman and John Keble in two volumes two years after Richard Hurrell Froude's untimely death on February 28, 1836, this work revealed the Tractarians' hostility toward Evangelicalism and the Protestant heritage from which they drew inspiration. Richard Hurrell Froude, *Remains of the late Reverend Richard Hurrell Froude*, ed. John Henry Newman and John Keble (London: C. J. G. & F. Rivington, 1838).

⁶⁴⁸ Turner, *John Henry Newman*, 313-314.

⁶⁴⁹ The legendary status of Newman's pulpit was memorably captured by Matthew Arnold's retrospective evocation of "the charm of that spiritual apparition, gliding in the dim afternoon light through the aisles of St. Mary's, rising into the pulpit, and then, in the most entrancing of voices, breaking the silence with words and thoughts which were a religious music,—subtle, sweet, mournful." Ker, *John Henry Newman*, 90. For a concise review of the six volumes that comprise Newman's *PPS*, see Owen Chadwick, *Newman* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1983), 18-23.

⁶⁵⁰ Particularly the *Lectures on the Prophetical Office of the Church* (delivered in the spring of 1836) and *Lectures on the Doctrine of Justification* (the first of which was delivered on April 13 and the final on June 1, 1837).

⁶⁵¹ Sheridan, *Newman on Justification*, 206.

. . Newman's version of the fourth-century crisis, then, rests upon a characterization of Arianism as radically 'other' in several respects. It is the forerunner of stolid Evangelicalism, Erastian worldliness ('carnal, self indulgent religion'), and—by 1874 [when he revised his *Lectures on Justification*], anyway—the new style of university theology.⁶⁵²

Standing beside Williams, on the other side of the spectrum from Sheridan's interpretation, is the view of Frank Turner who argues that the structure of the *Apologia* was purposefully designed to conceal Newman's antipathy for evangelicals, "a dislike bordering on hatred that had been the single most energizing force in his thought and theology during the 1830s and early 1840s."⁶⁵³ Turner provides credible evidence that in the *Apologia* "Newman assiduously recast that Tractarian assault on evangelical religion into a struggle against liberals and Liberalism whose victim he claimed to have been."⁶⁵⁴ Such a strategy, argues Turner, promised to recast Newman as a champion of dogmatic religious truth during the controversial years of the 1860s when he was *persona non grata* in most religious circles. The strength of Turner's case is tarnished, however, by his tendency of subjecting Newman to psychological analysis, even at the level of his subconscious motives, an approach has met with a negative reception, not least among some well-established Newman scholars.⁶⁵⁵ Nevertheless, Turner seems to be onto something when he points out the significance of Evangelicalism as a fundamental force of provocation for Newman during his Tractarian period.

There is a way of reading Newman that can retain the worthwhile element of Turner's insight—that evangelicals indeed occupied the foreground with Liberals in motivating the *via media*—without necessitating Turner's full-blown theory. This fact comes

⁶⁵² Williams, *Arius: Heresy and Tradition*, 5.

⁶⁵³ Turner, *John Henry Newman*, 9.

⁶⁵⁴ Most of Turner's case turns on evidence that supports the intensity of Newman's opposition to Evangelicalism during the 1830s and 1840s. For example, he cites the Unitarian theologian, James Martineau, who recalled Newman having "assailed the Evangelical party with every weapon of antipathy which could be drawn from the armory of imagination or logic, Scripture or history," *ibid.* Turner also offers a rhetorical analysis of Newman's appendix, added to the *Apologia* in 1865, in which he redefines the meaning of "Liberalism," *ibid.*, 10-11.

⁶⁵⁵ It is noteworthy that among the thirteen essays in *The Cambridge Companion to John Henry Newman*, which was published seven years after Turner's work, there is not a single mention of Turner. Ker and Merrigan, *Cambridge Companion*.

when we recognize that in Newman's view Evangelicalism tended toward Liberalism.⁶⁵⁶

Notice, for instance, how Newman makes this connection in his *Lectures on the Prophetical Office*:

Before Germany had become rationalistic, and Geneva Socinian, Romanism might be considered as the most dangerous corruption of the gospel. . . . But at this day, when the connexion of Protestantism with infidelity is so evident, what claim has the former upon our sympathy? And to what theology can the serious Protestant, dissatisfied with his system, betake himself but to Romanism, unless we [Anglo-Catholics] display our characteristic principles, and show him that he may be Catholic and Apostolic, yet not Roman?⁶⁵⁷

In this statement Newman manages to portray contemporary Protestantism as fostering unbelief like the rationalistic Germans (i.e. Liberals) and the theologically minimalist Socinians.⁶⁵⁸ The place where this was most obvious, from Newman's point of view, was in the evangelical emphasis upon "private interpretation,"⁶⁵⁹ a concept that he regarded as open to absurdity.⁶⁶⁰ For example, Newman, in his sermon titled "Unreal Words" (published in 1840) exclaims his frustration with the myriad of religious voices claiming to pronounce authoritatively upon issues of doctrine: "Let us avoid talking, of whatever kind; whether mere empty talking, or censorious talking, or idle profession, or descanting upon Gospel doctrines, or the affectation of philosophy, or the pretence of eloquence."⁶⁶¹

⁶⁵⁶ Ian Ker's research supports this connection. In the context of describing Newman's opposition to the inroads of Rationalism, he writes, "The result was that 'idea of Mystery' was 'discarded', and religion took on a subjective rather than objective character. The blame is laid squarely on Evangelical Christianity, which directs 'its attention to the heart itself, not to anything external to us. . . ." Ker, *John Henry Newman*, 122. Ker makes the same point later in his volume when he described John Henry's frustration with the evangelical faith of his younger brother, Francis Newman (199).

⁶⁵⁷ Newman, *Lectures on the prophetical office*, 25.

⁶⁵⁸ "Socinianism," in the context of nineteenth century inter-denominational rhetoric, had more to do with "minimally dogmatic Christianity based on reason and toleration" than adherence to a particular set of doctrinal tenets. Turner, *John Henry Newman*, 14.

⁶⁵⁹ Ibid., 262.

⁶⁶⁰ So Newman writes in his *Lectures on the Prophetical Office of the Church*, "Scripture is not so clear—in God's providential arrangement, to which we submit—as to hinder ordinary persons, who read it for themselves, from being Sabellians, or Independents, or Weslyans" (180). This appears in "Lecture Six" titled "On the Abuse of Private Judgment," (175-204).

⁶⁶¹ Newman, *PPS*, 987.

As Newman felt threatened by the subjective impulse of Evangelicalism, the feeling of suspicion and opposition was eventually reciprocated.⁶⁶² In its first review of the *Tracts* in 1833, the *Christian Observer* described the publication as coming from “a Society formed at Oxford, the members of which, professing themselves to be the most orthodox upholders of the Church, have begun to scatter throughout the land publications which, for bigotry, Popery, and intolerance surpass the writings even of Laud and Sacheverall.”⁶⁶³ This was among the first public shots that would eventually develop into a full-scale doctrinal battle.

In response to opposition from the *Christian Observer*, specifically after its castigation of Pusey’s tracts on baptismal regeneration,⁶⁶⁴ Newman promised to publicly address the doctrine of justification in order to demonstrate that the teaching of the *Tracts* in general and these tracts in particular were in fact consistent with the *Articles of Religion*.⁶⁶⁵ After submitting two letters of response for publication,⁶⁶⁶ Newman decided to deliver a lecture series on the doctrine of justification in Adam de Brome’s chapel at Saint Mary’s, Oxford. It was spring of 1837.⁶⁶⁷

Significant as the attack on Pusey was, there were additional factors motivating Newman to address the doctrine of justification. Evangelical critics of the *Tracts* proceeded to cast aspersions on what they viewed as the Oxford Movement’s desire to revive the Roman doctrine of infused righteousness.⁶⁶⁸ An opportunity for evangelicals to assert this contention came when George Stanley Faber published his work, *The Primitive Doctrine of*

⁶⁶² It is sometimes overlooked that many evangelicals recognized a degree of kinship with Tractarians in the early phase of the Oxford Movement. David Newsome, “Justification and Sanctification: Newman and the Evangelicals,” *Journal of Theological Studies* 15 (1964): 33-34.

⁶⁶³ Turner, *John Henry Newman*, 173.

⁶⁶⁴ Pusey’s three tracts, numbered 67, 68, and 69, were titled, “Scriptural Views of Holy Baptism as Established by the Consent of the Ancient Church and Contrasted with the Systems of Modern Schools.” The *Christian Observer* leveled a personal attack upon Pusey, concluding with the question, “Will any approver of the Oxford Tracts answer in Print?” Perry, “Newman’s Treatment of Luther,” 308.

⁶⁶⁵ Toon, *Evangelical Theology*, 141.

⁶⁶⁶ The first, dated January 11, 1837, argued for baptism as a gift particular to the Second Testament. The second letter, dated March 3 of the same year, clarified that Pusey had not written all that the *Observer* had accused of him. Newman then demanded to know what in Pusey’s tract had violated the Thirty-Nine Articles. Perry, “Newman’s Treatment of Luther,” 308-309.

⁶⁶⁷ Chadwick, “The Lectures on Justification,” 288.

⁶⁶⁸ Toon, *Evangelical Theology*, 141.

Justification Investigated (1837).⁶⁶⁹ Faber, a thoroughgoing evangelical, endeavored to prove against Alexander Knox (an Irish lay theologian), and against Joseph Milner (Newman's favorite evangelical church historian), that the Protestant doctrine of justification by faith was rooted in the teaching of the early Fathers before it was corrupted by the medieval scholastics. When a review of Faber's work asserted that "we see no substantial difference between the doctrine of Trent and the doctrines of Mr. Knox and the Oxford Tracts," a quarrel erupted.⁶⁷⁰

On account of his appreciation for the writing of Alexander Knox (d. 1831), Newman's attention was drawn to the dispute.⁶⁷¹ Newman's interest centered on Knox's essay, "On Justification," written in 1810, which belonged to a volume of Knox's letters and papers titled the *Remains*.⁶⁷² Originally prepared by the Rev. James John Hornby in 1834, Newman edited the updated edition in 1837.⁶⁷³ Scott Murray summarizes the basic thrust and effect of the essay when he writes: "Knox argued that the Church of England no longer held justification as an *usus forensis* but rather as a moral renovation. This article apparently stirred to a blaze a simmering controversy between the High Churchmen and the Evangelicals in the Church of England."⁶⁷⁴ Against this backdrop, Newman's *Lectures on the Doctrine of Justification* was intended to set the record straight.

H. The *Lectures on the Doctrine of Justification*

Newman's *Lectures on the Doctrine of Justification* was (and still is) a lightning rod. On the positive side, Henry Chadwick calls it "a book that deserves to be ranked at least on a par

⁶⁶⁹ George Stanley Faber, *The primitive doctrine of justification investigated: relatively to the several definitions of the Church of Rome and the Church of England and a special reference to the opinions of the late Mr. Knox, as published in his Remains* (London: R.B. Seeley and W. Burnside, 1837).

⁶⁷⁰ Toon, *Evangelical Theology*, 142.

⁶⁷¹ Ian Ker calls Knox "the Irish forerunner of the Tractarians" in his *John Henry Newman*, 115.

⁶⁷² Alexander Knox, *Remains of Alexander Knox*, ed. James John Hornby (London: James Duncan 1834).

⁶⁷³ McGrath, *ID*, 296.

⁶⁷⁴ Murray, "Luther in Newman's *Lectures*," 155.

with any of his more widely read writings on theology.”⁶⁷⁵ Ian Ker describes it as “a pioneering classic of ‘ecumenical theology.’”⁶⁷⁶ According to Alfred Plummer, the German historian J. J. Döllinger “always spoke of Newman’s *Justification* as the greatest masterpiece of theology that England had produced in a hundred years.”⁶⁷⁷ With similar approbation, the Swedish historian Yngve Brilioth regarded the *Lectures* as “perhaps the chief theological document of the Oxford Movement.”⁶⁷⁸ On the other hand, there have been a fair number of detractors. George Stanley Faber, mentioned above, found Newman’s volume to be “confused and confusing.”⁶⁷⁹ Richard Holt Sutton dismissed the work as “somewhat straw-chopping and dry.”⁶⁸⁰ Most significantly, Bishop Charles Pettit M’Ilvaine of Ohio, whose lineage and personal interests belonged to Britain, was so disturbed by Newman’s position that he published a refutation in the form of a book of over five hundred pages entitled *Oxford Divinity compared with that of the Romish and Anglican Churches with a special view of the doctrine of Justification by Faith* (1841).⁶⁸¹ Whatever one’s perspective, the *Lectures on Justification* generally elicits a forceful and definite response.⁶⁸²

David Newsome suggests that the *Lectures on Justification* may also be viewed as a clarification of sermons which Newman preached from the previous decade at Saint Mary’s in which he sought to disprove the Protestant doctrine of justification by faith only.⁶⁸³ Unlike his sermons, however, the *Lectures* speak with a strongly polemical tone in repudiation of the beliefs that he had once held as an evangelical. Precisely because the doctrine of justification was so central to popular Protestantism, with its axiomatic focus upon a spiritual conversion, this subject was for Newman more than personal or theological; it was

⁶⁷⁵ Chadwick, “The Lectures on Justification,” 287.

⁶⁷⁶ Ker, *John Henry Newman*, 157.

⁶⁷⁷ Chadwick, “The Lectures on Justification,” 289.

⁶⁷⁸ Brilioth, *The Anglican Revival*, 282.

⁶⁷⁹ Ward, *The Life of John Henry*, 432.

⁶⁸⁰ Richard Holt Hutton, *Cardinal Newman*, 2nd ed. (London: Methuen, 1891), 83.

⁶⁸¹ Charles Pettit M’Ilvaine, *Oxford divinity compared with that of the Romish and Anglican Churches: with a special view of the doctrine of justification by faith* (London: R.B. Seeley and W. Burnside 1841).

⁶⁸² Toon, *Evangelical Theology*, 141-170.

⁶⁸³ Newsome, “Justification and Sanctification,” 33. Many of these messages were published in the first three volumes of the *PPS* (originally published in 1834, 1835, and 1836, respectively).

symbolic. Henry Chadwick is correct to point out that, "Without a treatment in some depth of the issue of justification, his statement of the *via media* must be gravely incomplete."⁶⁸⁴ Now, at the age of thirty-six, Newman was evidently ready to conduct such a treatment.

The *Lectures* were initiated in Adam de Brome chapel on April 13, 1837. They were revised and published on March 30, 1838.⁶⁸⁵ Newman's primary object for writing, according to Sheridan, "was to show how the Church of England understands the axiom 'justification by faith only.'"⁶⁸⁶ Newman presented the position of Rome on justification as mostly true, but in some respects "defective."⁶⁸⁷ The "ultra-Protestant" position (i.e., Evangelicalism), however, he denounces as simply "erroneous."⁶⁸⁸ Even though Newman was meticulous in editing the *Lectures*,⁶⁸⁹ it makes no pretense of being a systematic treatment of the subject.⁶⁹⁰ So Sheridan writes, "[W]hile the overall picture is clear enough, the synthesis of the *Lectures* is far from complete in secondary details. There are some loose ends that do not fit into the complete pattern."⁶⁹¹

The Lectures should be understood as part of the larger project of Newman's *via media* with his *Lectures on the Prophetical Office of the Church, Parochial and Plain Sermons, Tracts for the Times*, and Froude's *Remains*. Thus, Newman opens the Advertisement to his Third Edition:

These Lectures on the doctrine of Justification formed one of a series of works projected by the Author in illustration of what has often been considered to be the

⁶⁸⁴ Chadwick, "The Lectures on Justification," 289.

⁶⁸⁵ Newman dedicated his *Lectures* to Richard Bagot, Bishop of Oxford, hoping to receive an endorsement and was heartbroken when Bagot had reservations. Gilley, *Newman and His Age*, 176-177.

⁶⁸⁶ Sheridan, *Newman on Justification*, 247. Newman writes as much himself in his *Apologia*, "I wrote my Essay on Justification in 1837; it was aimed at the Lutheran dictum that justification by faith only was the cardinal doctrine of Christianity." Newman, *Apo*, 72.

⁶⁸⁷ Newman, *Jfc*, 2.

⁶⁸⁸ Ibid.

⁶⁸⁹ Ker, *John Henry Newman*, 149-150.

⁶⁹⁰ It should be remembered that Newman was simultaneously editing Froude's *Remains* when he was getting his *Lectures on Justification* ready for publication (Ker, *John Henry Newman*, 147-149). Froude's infamous animosity for Protestantism, coupled with Newman's intense emotional attachment to his recently deceased friend, may have further sharpened the edge of Newman's polemic.

⁶⁹¹ Sheridan, *Newman on Justification*, 239.

characteristic position of the Anglican Church, as lying in a supposed *Via Media*, admitting much and excluding much both of Roman and of Protestant teaching.⁶⁹²

Newman states his chief contention with Protestantism when he writes “that the Church considers the doctrine of justification by faith only to be a *principle* and the religion of the day takes it as a *rule of conduct*.”⁶⁹³ The tragic effect, as Newman saw it, was to reduce Christian faith to a subjective experience and to discard the urgency of obedience in favor of antinomianism.⁶⁹⁴ Facing such a crisis, Newman’s endeavored to steer a middle course between what he perceived as the extremes of solafideism (which he associates with “Lutherans who opposed Melanchthon”) and works-righteousness (namely, “Vásquez, Caietan, and other extreme writers of the Roman school”).⁶⁹⁵ Against these extremes, Newman occasionally identifies his position with the “English divines,” by which he largely meant the “Caroline divines,”⁶⁹⁶ in grounding justification in the instrumental causation of faith *and* works.⁶⁹⁷

⁶⁹² Newman, *Jfc*, ix.

⁶⁹³ *Ibid.*, 333.

⁶⁹⁴ We are reminded of Thomas Scott’s influence on Newman, which instilled a robust commitment to holiness and an antipathy for lawless faith. Sheridan, *Newman on Justification*, 26-29.

⁶⁹⁵ Newman, *Jfc*, 2. Newman’s reading of Catholic authors was equally facile. Bellarmine and Vásquez receive only a passing quotation. Newman evidently believed the Catholic Church to teach that believers are justified on account of their renewal, *Jfc.*, 154. It is precisely this assumption that Newman clarifies in the Third Edition of his *Lectures* (1874), *Jfc.*, ix-xiv.

⁶⁹⁶ *Ibid.*, 3. The “Caroline” divines (from *Carolus*, the Latin name for Charles) are the primary Anglican theologians and devotional writers during the reigns of Charles I (1625-49) and Charles II (1648-85). For an introduction to the general theological contributions of the Caroline Divines see Benjamin Guyer, *The Beauty of Holiness: The Caroline Divines and Their Writings* (London: Canterbury Press Norwich, 2012). For a closer look at what these divines taught on the doctrine of justification, particularly John Davenant, William Forbes, Henry Hammond, Jeremy Taylor and George Bull, see William Douglas Bryant, “Bishop George Bull’s Doctrine of Justification” (Ph.D. Dissertation, The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2011).

⁶⁹⁷ Newman, *Jfc*, 275-276. In affirmation of Bull, Newman asserts, “By faith, according to Bishop Bull, is meant *fides formata charitate et operibus*, or the obedience which is of faith,” (358). Newman looked chiefly to George Bull’s *Harmonia Apostolica*, an Anglican attempt to reconcile Paul and James by stating that we are justified by faith *and* works. George Bull, *Harmonia apostolica: or, Two dissertations : in the former of which the doctrine of St. James on justification by works is explained and defended: in the latter, the agreement of St. Paul with St. James is clearly shown* Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology (Oxford: J. H. Parker, 1842).

Aware of the controversy crouching at his door, especially among evangelicals, the footnotes of Newman's *Lectures* mainly refer to Protestant authors. While Bishop George Bull (1634-1710) and Jeremy Taylor (1613-1667) are occasionally presented as precursors of Newman's position,⁶⁹⁸ a strong emphasis upon such infamous anti-Calvinists would not have served him well.⁶⁹⁹ Instead, he gives more attention to Richard Hooker (1554-1600) and a less occasional reference to John Davenant (1606-1668).⁷⁰⁰ McGrath exposes the problematic way in which Newman connects the dots from Anglican history to his own position.⁷⁰¹ After examining these historical movements, McGrath concludes:

Newman's use of the later Caroline divines to determine what constitutes an authentically Anglican doctrine of justification is deeply problematic. The theology of justification of the post-Restoration divines, such as Bull and Taylor, by no means represents a unanimous or even the majority opinion within contemporary Anglicanism.⁷⁰²

The biggest historiographical error in Newman's *Lectures*, however, is his treatment of Martin Luther. Newman gets Luther badly wrong, ostensibly collapsing his doctrine of justification into 19th Century Evangelicalism.⁷⁰³ Newman's relative ignorance of Luther's

⁶⁹⁸ Passing references to these men are found in Newman, *Jfc.* vii, 13, 16, 159, 358.

⁶⁹⁹ For an explanation of how Anglican theology moved from its "Classical" form (i.e. Hooker, Davenant, and Ussher) to the anti-Calvinist, "Caroline" variety (i.e. Taylor, Bull, and Barrow), see C. Fitzsimons Allison, *The Rise of Moralism: The Proclamation of the Gospel from Hooker to Baxter* (New York: Seabury Press, 1966). For an account of how this history unfolded before it is appropriated by Newman, see McGrath, *ID*, 277-283.

⁷⁰⁰ Most of these references are found in Newman's Appendix. He pits Davenant against Calvin, for instance, to argue with Davenant that Christ's righteousness is not a personal possession of the believer, *Jfc.*, 362. Hooker appears with more frequency, *Jfc.*, 125, 375, 378, 382-384, 400-404.

⁷⁰¹ McGrath explains how Newman was at variance with some of the pre-Commonwealth divines and therefore concludes his *Lectures* with reference to on three Anglican luminaries, Hooker, Taylor, and Barrow. In Newman's words, "I will appeal in conclusion to the three who have sometimes been considered the special lights of our later Church, Hooker, Taylor, and Barrow; of whom two will be found to sanction me, and the third, though apparently pronouncing the other way, to withdraw his judgment while he gives it," *Jfc.*, 400. McGrath explains why this claim is fallacious, *ID*, 282-284.

⁷⁰² McGrath, *ID*, 299.

⁷⁰³ We all have lenses, and there is no such thing as a view from nowhere. In Newman's case, however, the issues of his day exercised an excessive degree of control over his interpretation. This was true, for instance, of Newman's works on *The Arians of the Fourth Century*, where Newman portrays Antiochene devotion, on account of its literal interpretation of Scripture, as inferior to the spirituality of the Alexandrian tradition. The correlation to evangelical literalism of his own day is thinly veiled. Williams, *Arius: Heresy and Tradition*, 4-5, 158.

Reformation, his inability to read German, and poor translation of Luther's 1533 *Commentary on Galatians* (which was purged of anything that smelled Roman), worked against him.⁷⁰⁴ It is telling that Newman quotes from the John Gerhard's *Loci Theologici* more than from Luther and Melanchthon.⁷⁰⁵ Most troublesome is when Newman quotes Luther with selective omissions that have the effect of altering the meaning of Luther's doctrine.⁷⁰⁶ McGrath conducts an analysis of the most egregious of these instances and charitably concludes that the fault is probably owing to inadequate English translations of Luther.⁷⁰⁷

Newman's most severe critique of Luther (and by extension the evangelicals whom he represents) is reserved for the final chapter titled "On Preaching the Gospel." By this point Newman has made his case. According to the "Advertisement to the Third Edition" (1874), his argument hangs together according to the following outline.⁷⁰⁸ (1.) The first two lectures delineate the Protestant and Catholic doctrines of justification. (2.) Three lectures—3rd, 4th, and 5th—inquire into the meaning of the term "Justification." (3.) The next four—6th, 7th, 8th, and 9th—determine what "real thing" is denoted by the term "justification." (4.) In the 10th, 11th, and 12th, the office and nature of Faith is examined in relation to justification. A sixty-one page appendix is devoted to understanding justification's formal cause from the history of Christian thought.⁷⁰⁹ However, in between lecture 12 and the appendix is lecture

⁷⁰⁴ Chadwick, "The Lectures on Justification," 294. In footnote 19 Chadwick suggests, "Much of what Newman knew is likely to have come through J. Milner's *History of the Church of Christ*. . . where Luther dominates the account of the Reformation and is given a pietist face."

⁷⁰⁵ Johann Gerhard (1582-1637), a scholastic scholar and Lutheran pastor, was the most popular Lutheran theologian in England during the nineteenth century. Guyer, *The Beauty of Holiness: The Caroline Divines and Their Writings*, 22. Newman concentrates on volume 3 of Gerhard's *Loci Theologici*, *De Justificatione Per Fidem*.

⁷⁰⁶ Newman, *Jfc*, 331-333. McGrath examines the most grievous example of misquotation in which Newman cites Luther to prove that justification is in some sense based on works, when, in fact, the omitted section asserts that justification is by faith alone, *ID*, 305-306.

⁷⁰⁷ McGrath, *ID*, 306-307.

⁷⁰⁸ Newman, *Jfc*, xiv.

⁷⁰⁹ Newman's appendix originated in his First Edition (1838). A few additional comments, however, indicated in brackets, appear in the Third Edition (1874). These appear on pages 31, 73, 96, 101, 154, 186, 187, 190, 198, 201, 226, 236, 260, 343, 348-349, and 353. Newman provides a helpful introduction to such changes when he writes: "The purpose of this Appendix is to show that the cardinal question to be considered by Catholics and Protestants in their controversy about

13, where, in Newman's words, "practical application is made of the principles and conclusions of the foregoing Lectures, to the mode of preaching and professing the Gospel, popular thirty or forty years since, called evangelical."⁷¹⁰ Here Newman the pastor pulls out all the superlatives and speaks with an extraordinary degree of candor.

The point of this chapter, as Newman's clever turn-of-phrase states, is primarily concerned with responding to the "imputation of legalism" from evangelical detractors. Newman spins the Protestant argument on its head by insisting that it is not creeds, rites and works that inculcate self-righteousness and superstition; rather, it is Luther's position of "faith only." In addition to communicating the concern of this chapter, it also gives voice to the fundamental burden of Newman's overall *Lectures*:

Men congratulate themselves on their emancipation from forms and their enlightened worship, when they are but in the straight course to a worse captivity, and are exchanging dependence on the creature for dependence on self.

I observe, then, that what the Jews felt concerning their Law, is exactly what many upholders of the tenet of "faith only," feel concerning what they consider faith; that they substitute faith for Christ; they so regard it, that instead of being the way to Him, it is in this way; that they make it a something to rest in; nay, that they alter the meaning of the word, as the Jews altered the meaning of the word Law; in short, that, under the pretence of light and liberty, they have brought into the Gospel the narrow, minute, technical, nay, I will say carnal and hollow system of the Pharisees. . . . And thus faith and (what is called) spiritual-mindedness are dwelt on as ends, and obstruct the view of Christ, just as the Law was perverted by the Jews.⁷¹¹

After the original version of Newman's *Lectures* was released in 1838, a second edition was published in 1840 with simple formatting changes. It was in 1874, five years before he was elevated to the Catholic Cardinalate, when Newman published the third and final edition. His stated reason for doing so appears in the opening page of the Advertisement to the Third Edition, "Unless the Author held in substance in 1874 what he published in 1838, he would not at this time be reprinting what he wrote as an Anglican; certainly not with so little

Justification is, What is the *formal cause*? When this is properly examined, it will be found that there is little or no difference of view between the disputants, except when the Protestant party adheres to the paradox of Luther:--"Sola fides, non fides formata charitate, justificat: fides justificat sine et ante charitatem," and refuses to assign a formal cause," 343 [391].

⁷¹⁰ Newman, *Jfc*, xiv.

⁷¹¹ *Ibid.*, 323-326.

added by way of safeguard.”⁷¹² This resembles what Newman says in his *Apologia*: “What I held in 1816, I held in 1833, and I hold in 1864.”⁷¹³ In our next chapter, after summarizing the substance of Newman’s position, we will consider whether his claim to consistency is in fact true.

I. Conclusion

We have considered how Newman’s religious background led him from “a conventional, non-sacramental middle-class” experience of faith,⁷¹⁴ to a Calvinistic variety of Evangelicalism (1816-1827), through a brief flirtation with Liberalism (1828), and eventually into the so called Oxford Movement (1833-1838). The high point of Newman’s *via media* was in 1841 when he composed his famous *Tract 90*, at which time his Tractarian balloon quickly popped and gradually deflated until October 9, 1845 when he was received into the Catholic Church by Fr. Dominic Barberi of the Passionist Order.⁷¹⁵ The following overview recounts the high points of this chapter concerning the development of Newman’s religious thought between the years 1816 and 1838.

From Thomas Scott of Aston Sandford, Newman acquired a deep appreciation for the holiness of the Triune God and the utter depravity of human nature, values that remained with him to the end of his life. In 1823 when Newman became a fellow at Oriel College, Oxford, the Calvinist orientation of his faith fell under siege. Edward Pusey pushed on Newman’s doctrine of imputation. Edward Hawkins challenged his bifurcation of humanity between “real” and “pseudo” Christians and instilled an appreciation for the church fathers. After months of such influence and study, particularly of the fourth century fathers, Newman started to reconsider his position on the authority of tradition and the objectivity of the sacraments. He eventually abandoned the evangelical doctrines of *sola scriptura* and *sola fide* in exchange for an affirmation of the authority of oral tradition and baptismal regeneration. Thanks to the doctrine of uncreated grace, which he imbibed from

⁷¹² Ibid., ix.

⁷¹³ Newman, *Apo*, 49.

⁷¹⁴ Gilley, “Life and Writings,” 1.

⁷¹⁵ Ker, *John Henry Newman*, 316-321.

the Alexandrian father and Petavius, Newman regarded himself to be in subscription to the *Thirty-Nine Articles*.

The year of 1833 was significant. According to Newman, Keble's assize sermon, "National Apostasy," marked the beginning of the Oxford Movement. From it developed the notion of Anglicanism as a *via media* between Roman Catholicism and Protestantism. Through various mediums, starting with his *Lectures on the Prophetical Office* (1837), Newman works this position out in terms of the development of the church's "prophetic tradition." Realizing that he would eventually need to address his *via media* to the doctrine of justification—a central tenet of Evangelicalism—the conflict surrounding Alexander Knox was just the right occasion in which to articulate his position.

The first lecture on justification was delivered on April 13, 1837 and the final on June 1 of the same year. The general purpose of their composition was "to show how the Church of England understands the axiom 'justification by faith only.'"⁷¹⁶ His answer to this question is perhaps best summarized in the most frequently quoted sentence of his volume: "Justification comes *through* the Sacraments; is received *by* faith; *consists* in God's inward presence; and *lives* in obedience."⁷¹⁷ The precise meaning of this statement will be the subject of our next chapter.

⁷¹⁶ Sheridan, *Newman on Justification*, 247; Newman, *Apo*, 72.

⁷¹⁷ Newman, *Jfc*, 278.

Chapter Four

John Henry Newman's Doctrine of Justification

A. Theological Contours of Newman's Doctrine of Justification.

Having examined the background to Newman's doctrine of justification, we will now analyze the substance of his position. The leading edge of our inquiry is concerned with identifying the fundamental ground for justification, the formal cause by which Newman understood God to remove guilt and impart righteousness to sinners.

Like Vermigli, Newman refuses to drive a wedge between the options of justification as a legal declaration and the process of internal renewal. In this way Newman stands in close proximity to the Reformed tradition by holding a forensic action (based upon an *iustitia alienum*) in simultaneous harmony with the ongoing work of love and charity (based on an *impertita iustitia*). Defining the precise manner of this internal work will require careful attention.

Newman highlights the forensic nature of justification by distinguishing the declaration from the gift that it declares. While unified in a single act, the two are regarded as notionally distinct, starting with the Voice of the Lord that pronounces one to be righteous:

Justification is the "glorious Voice of the Lord" declaring us to be righteous. That it is a declaration not a making, is sufficiently clear from this one argument that it is the justification of a *sinner*, of one who *has been* a sinner; and the past cannot be reversed except by *accounting* it reversed.⁷¹⁸

Motivating this legal pronouncement is "a real and gracious act on God's part towards us sinners."⁷¹⁹ Following Augustine, Newman highlights the initiative of grace, occasioned by the human problem of guilt, the impious nature in which sinners are naturally born, and

⁷¹⁸ John Henry Newman, *Jfc*, 67 [71-72].

⁷¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 72 [77]. One of Newman's most distilled statements on the sufficiency and efficacy of grace is near the conclusion of his sermon "The Mystery of Godliness," published in 1840, where he writes, "'Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to His mercy He has saved us.' We are reminded that we can do nothing, and that God does everything," in Newman's *PPS* (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1997), 1020; hereafter abbreviated as *PPS*.

according to which they are justly condemned.⁷²⁰ To deny this, or to rely upon one's own righteousness, says Newman, is the sin of pride, a vice that he routinely opposed in the Liberalism of his day.⁷²¹ But unlike Augustine, Newman recognizes the need for an "imputing righteousness,"⁷²² an "estimation of righteousness [in Christ] vouchsafed to the past, and extending from the past to the present as far as the present is affected by the past."⁷²³ In other words, since the problem of human guilt is exhibited before the judgment seat of God, a particularly *judicial* action is therefore supposed.⁷²⁴

Newman read the Evangelicals of his day as holding that justification consisted in a *mere* imputation and he therefore devoted roughly the first third of his *Lectures* (1838) to showing the distinction but no separation between justification and renewal.⁷²⁵ His problem is not with "imputation" per se; what he rejects is a "mere" imputation.⁷²⁶ In this way, Newman concedes that justification "viewed relatively to the past is forgiveness of sin, for nothing more it can be; but considered as to the present and future it is more, it is renewal wrought in us by the Spirit of Him who by His merits completes what is defective in that renewal."⁷²⁷

Newman is equally insistent on the internal work of the Spirit: "The Voice of the Lord is mighty in *operation*. . .; it has a sacramental power, being the instrument as well as the sign of His will."⁷²⁸ Concerning the content of this activity, Newman writes, "Imputed righteousness is the coming in of actual righteousness," since God's word never returns to him void, but accomplishes what he pleases.⁷²⁹ Reaching beyond a mere legal declaration

⁷²⁰ Jan Hendrik Walgrave, *Newman the Theologian: the Nature of Belief and Doctrine as Exemplified in His Life and Works*, trans. A. V. Little (London: G. Chapman, 1960), 42-44. Newman explains how divine grace overcomes the unrighteousness of original sin in *Jfc.*, 88-91 [95-96].

⁷²¹ Louis Bouyer, *Newman: His Life and Spirituality* (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 2011), 19.

⁷²² Newman, *Jfc.*, 67 [72].

⁷²³ *Ibid.*, 68 [72-73].

⁷²⁴ *Ibid.*, 72 [76-77].

⁷²⁵ *Ibid.*, 63.

⁷²⁶ *Ibid.* Newman explains his understanding of imputation at some length in 67-78 [72-83].

⁷²⁷ *Ibid.*, 36 [38].

⁷²⁸ *Ibid.*, 79-80 [86].

⁷²⁹ *Ibid.*, 80 [86].

into the realms of history and ethics, justification establishes new creation by means of the indwelling presence of God:

He [God] imputes, not a name but a substantial Word, which, being “ingrafted” in our own hearts, “is able to save our souls. . . . God’s word, I say, effects what it announces. This is its characteristic all through Scripture. He “calleth those things which be not, as though they are,” and they are forthwith. Thus in the beginning He *said*, “Let there be light, and there *was* light. Word and deed went together in creation; and so again ‘in the regeneration.’”⁷³⁰

In Newman’s *et. . . et* approach, insisting on both a forensic *and* an operative justification, he presupposes a *duplex iustitia* in which accounting righteous and making righteousness are bound together in an organic unity. Throughout his *Lectures on Justification*, Newman explains this pattern with the datum of redemptive history, where the one vindicated by God is also renovated, insisting that the two activities go hand-in-hand. In one of the more common quotes from Newman’s *Lectures*, he writes:

We may, if we will, divide this event into parts, and say that it is *both* pardon *and* renovation, but such a division is merely mental, and does not affect the change itself, which is but one act. If a man is saved from drowning, you may, if you will, say he is *both* rescued from the water *and* brought into the atmospheric air; this is a discrimination in words and not in things. . . . In like manner, there is, in fact, no middle state between a state of *wrath* and a state of *holiness*. In justifying, God takes away what is past, *by* bringing in what is new. He snatches us out of the fire by lifting us in His everlasting hands, and enwrapping us in His own glory.⁷³¹

In this particular analogy, it is difficult to see how deliverance from the suffocating water unto the freedom of atmospheric air illustrates the movement from justification (salvation from divine wrath) unto sanctification (an increased realization of holiness). Both of these images signify the initial point of justification when one is delivered from the imminent danger of God’s judgment. Since Newman means by sanctification the development of actual righteousness, his analogy would benefit from something other than fresh air. Air, it turns out, is an excellent analogy for Newman’s concept of Divine Presence—something *extra nos* that reaches one’s interior and from that place provides life. Actual righteousness, however, in terms of manifesting good works, would be better represented by an image such as an impressive swim stroke.

⁷³⁰ Ibid., 80-81 [86-87].

⁷³¹ Ibid., 101-102 [112].

Another way to describe Newman's approach is in terms of the "both/and" relationship of justification and sanctification. Newman regards their distinction, which was so often argued by the evangelical party of the Church of England, as "technical and unscriptural."⁷³² This "unreal righteousness," says Newman, is an aberration:

Away then with this modern, this private, this arbitrary, this unscriptural system, which promising liberty conspires against it; which abolishes Christian Sacraments to introduce barren and dead ordinances; and for the real participation of the Son, and justification through the Spirit, would, at the very marriage feast, feed us on shells and husks, who hunger and thirst after righteousness. It is a new gospel, unless three hundred years stand for eighteen hundred; and if men are bent on seducing us from the ancient faith, let them provide a more specious error, a more alluring sophism, a more angelic tempter, than this.⁷³³

After critiquing the evangelical party, Newman levels a similar charge at the Roman Catholic position. His aim is not focused upon any official statements of the Church, but rather on some unnamed theologians who appeared to be reducing justification to the habit of obedience that results from God's favor. Such an approach, argues Newman, replaces a properly Christ-centered vision with unhealthy introspection (*incurvatus in se*).⁷³⁴

Newman added a footnote in the Third Edition (1874) of his *Lectures* which embellished upon his disagreement with the Catholic position and identifies the particular theologians whom he had in mind:

This school is elsewhere called in these Lectures ultra-Roman or extreme Romanist. Such Catholic divines as Caietan, Vasquez, and Bellarmine were intended by this title, who, by making justification consist in the habit of charity or again in good works, not in sanctifying grace as an initial and distinct gift from above, seemed to the writer to fix the mind, equally with Anglican Arminians, not on a Divine inward Presence vouchsafed to it, but on something of its own, as a ground to rest upon and take satisfaction in. Of course, such a judgment seems to him now unreal and arbitrary.⁷³⁵

Newman's qualification clarifies his point of disagreement with the Catholic position. Due to what he perceived as a reduction of justification to a religious transaction, an exchange of

⁷³² Ibid., 41 [44].

⁷³³ Ibid., 57 [61].

⁷³⁴ Ibid., 190 [220].

⁷³⁵ Ibid., 190 [statement contained in Footnote 1 of the Third Edition, absent from the 1838 version].

“the [mere] influence of grace, not as the operations of a living God, but as something to bargain about, and buy, and traffic...,” Newman expressed reservations about the phrase “inherent righteousness.”⁷³⁶

If the Presence of Christ is our true righteousness, first conveyed into us by Baptism, then more sacredly and mysteriously in the Eucharist, we have really no inherent righteousness at all. What seems to be inherent, may be more properly called *adherent*, depending as it does, wholly and absolutely upon the Divine indwelling, not ours to keep, but as heat in a sickly person, sustained by a cause distinct from himself.⁷³⁷

With this taxonomy Newman lays the groundwork for his *via media*. While “righteousness” is in the first place God’s forensic declaration, the essence of justification consists in the indwelling of the Divine Presence. Therefore, what Protestants commonly call “justification” (the judicial pronouncement) and sanctification (internal renewal) are joined as one, a point that Newman reiterates throughout his *Lectures*:

- “Justification and sanctification were [are] in fact substantially one and the same thing... [they are] parts of one gift, properties, qualities, or aspects of one.”⁷³⁸
- “Justification, then, *as such*, is an imputation; but the actual Gospel gift called justification is more, it is renewal also.”⁷³⁹
- “Justification renews, therefore I say it may fitly be called renewal.”⁷⁴⁰
- “It is a parallel mode of speaking, to say that justification *consists* in renewal, or that renewal *constitutes* justification.”⁷⁴¹
- “[Justification] consists of *two* parts, acceptance and renewal.”⁷⁴²
- “Again, we speak of being *baptized* with God’s *grace*; and thus we may allowably say that we are *justified* or accepted by *obedience*. And we might of course with

⁷³⁶ Ibid., 186-187 [216-217].

⁷³⁷ Ibid., 187 [217].

⁷³⁸ Ibid., 63 [112].

⁷³⁹ Ibid., 66 [71].

⁷⁴⁰ Ibid., 86 [93].

⁷⁴¹ Ibid., 86-87 [93-94].

⁷⁴² Ibid., 88 [95].

propriety urge that *baptism* is not a mere outward rite, but an *inward* power; and so we may say that *justification* is a *change of heart*.”⁷⁴³

- “I have been arguing from the essential union between justification and renewal, that they are practically convertible terms.”⁷⁴⁴

Even though Newman’s *Lectures* portray justification and sanctification as one, they also state that justification is in some sense the beginning of sanctification: “Justification tends to sanctify.”⁷⁴⁵ The elasticity of these terms enables Newman to affirm the Thirty-Nine Articles, when it says “We are accounted righteous before God, only for the merit of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ by Faith, and not for our own works or deservings.”⁷⁴⁶ How exactly this works, particularly with reference to the formal cause or ground of justification, is the critical question. The question will be taken up in the following pages, by considering the constituent elements of Newman’s position, their arrangement, and an evaluation of its theological integrity.

B. Incarnation

Instead of regarding justification as the *articulus stantis et cadentis ecclesiae*, Newman considered “incarnation” to be the chief tenet of Christian doctrine,⁷⁴⁷ what he called “the central truth of the Gospel, and the source whence we are to draw out its principles.”⁷⁴⁸ To some degree this reflects the historical and existential realities of Newman’s religious journey as expressed in his *Apologia* (1864) and in works like *Loss and Gain* (1848), in which

⁷⁴³ Ibid.

⁷⁴⁴ Ibid.

⁷⁴⁵ Ibid.

⁷⁴⁶ Church of England, “Articles of Religion, XI,” in *The Book of Common Prayer, and Administration of the Sacraments, and Other Rites and Ceremonies of the Church*. (London: Reeves, 1801).

⁷⁴⁷ Ian Ker, *Newman on Being a Christian* (Notre Dame, IN.: University of Notre Dame Press, 1990), 39.

⁷⁴⁸ John Henry Newman, *An Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine*, 6th ed. (Notre Dame, IN.: University of Notre Dame Press, 1989), 324. Elsewhere, Newman identifies fundamental components of apostolic faith, doctrines that he himself sought to promote, in terms of the Trinity, Incarnation, Atonement, original sin, the necessity of regeneration, supernatural grace mediated through the sacraments, apostolic succession, the necessity of faith and obedience, and the eternal scope of divine judgment. John Henry Newman, *Certain Difficulties Felt by Anglicans in Catholic Teaching Considered*, Vol 1. (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1908-1914), 128.

ecclesial and sacramental categories assert themselves with such force and definition that they function as an organizing principle for his theology in general and soteriology in particular.

On account of its central importance in Newman's thought, the concept of Christ's incarnation is a suitable place to begin a study of his doctrine of justification. This is so because Newman's principle of incarnation grows out of his own personal religious struggle, which may be summarized as a desire to commune with the living God—a value that reached back to his early days as an evangelical and on into subsequent years when he lived in the full embrace of monastic values and settings. This melodic line runs through the whole of Newman's religious experience and is even captured in the slogan of his coat of arms, "*cor ad cor loquitur*."⁷⁴⁹ What is the ultimate heart to which a human heart can ever hope to speak? Newman provides the answer through the heroine of his novel, *Callista* (1856), who points to the divine heart of God: "[T]here was a higher beauty than that which the order and harmony of the natural world revealed and a deeper peace and calm than that which the exercise whether of the intellect or the purest human affection can supply."⁷⁵⁰ To commune with God is the highest and most desirable end, and the incarnation makes this possible.

Newman's view of Christ's incarnation owes much to his reliance upon Eastern Fathers, a reliance he acquired in 1827 when he began to read a collection of patristic writings which Edward Pusey obtained for him in Germany.⁷⁵¹ This study led to Newman's first book, *The Arians of the Fourth Century* (1833), in which principles of the Alexandrian school, such as a high regard for the invisible presence of God and the inadequacy of human cognition for apprehending that presence, are developed and applied to the religious sociology of England in general and Oxford in particular.⁷⁵² Emerging from these principles

⁷⁴⁹ Charles Stephen Dessain, *The Spirituality of John Henry Newman* (Minneapolis: Winston Press, 1980), 33-34.

⁷⁵⁰ John Henry Newman, *Callista: A Sketch of the Third Century* (New York: D. & J. Sadlier & Co., 1856), 254.

⁷⁵¹ Philip Flanagan, *Newman, Faith and the Believer* (Westminster, Md.: Newman Bookshop, 1946), 29.

⁷⁵² The Alexandrians are generally considered to represent the Oxonian Platonists (whom Newman supports), while the Antioch school is a not so thinly veiled reference to rationalists such as evangelical literalists.

are themes that shaped Newman's theological vision for the remainder of his life, particularly the importance of preserving divine "mystery," *totus Christus*, and the sacramentality of the universe.⁷⁵³ The aggregate of these tenets may be expressed in terms of union with Christ and the saving effects that such solidarity produces.⁷⁵⁴ In Newman's words:

The sanctification, or rather the deification of the nature of man, is one main subject of St. Athanasius's theology. Christ, in rising, raises His saints with Him to the right hand of power. They become instinct with His life, of one body with His flesh, divine sons, immortal kings, gods. He is in them, because He is in human nature; and He communicates to them that nature deified by becoming His, that them It may deify.⁷⁵⁵

Thinking with the Eastern Tradition, Newman focuses on the persons of the Triune God to understand how divine life condescends in redemption. He concludes that it is in the Son of God "who came down on earth, and who thus, though graciously taking on Him[self] a new nature, remained in person as He had been from everlasting, the Son of the Father. . . ."⁷⁵⁶ Accordingly, the Son, precisely because he possesses the same nature as the Father and the Spirit, is never considered in abstract isolation from the members of the Godhead (as popular Evangelicalism was susceptible to doing); rather, the triune deity is the starting point for understanding the person and mission of the Incarnate Christ. So Newman writes, "In truth His Divine Sonship is that portion of the sacred doctrine, on which the mind is providentially intended to rest throughout, and so to preserve for itself his identity unbroken."⁷⁵⁷

The scope of Newman's incarnational theology is enhanced by the teaching of St. Ignatius of Antioch, which upholds the centrality of the Incarnation with the Atonement in salvation as events that are not simply in the past, "but as present facts, in an existing

⁷⁵³ Brian E. Daley, "The Church Fathers," in *The Cambridge Companion to John Henry Newman*, ed. Ian Ker and Terrance Merrigan (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), 29-46. One might add to this list the *disciplina arcani* (withholding central mysteries of the Christian faith from catechumens) and the development of oral tradition as a supplement to Scripture.

⁷⁵⁴ Charles Stephen Dessain, "Cardinal Newman and the Eastern Tradition," *Downside Review* 94 (1976): 95.

⁷⁵⁵ Newman, *Development of Christian Doctrine*, 140.

⁷⁵⁶ Newman, *PPS*, 1224-1225. This sermon was published in 1842.

⁷⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, 592.

mode, in which our Saviour comes to us.”⁷⁵⁸ Here one sees how the principle of Incarnation naturally leads to *totus Christus*, the embodiment of Christ’s person in his members. For example, in his sermon titled “The Mystery of Godliness,” (pub. 1840) Newman asserts:

He has taken our nature, and in and through it He sanctifies us. He is our brother by virtue of His incarnation, and, as the text says, “He is not ashamed to call us brethren;” and, having sanctified his nature in Himself, He communicates it to us.⁷⁵⁹

When Newman uses the plural “us” he wishes to stress, over against many of his evangelical contemporaries, the community of God’s people, and not simply the individual Christian. What is more, unlike the evangelical conception of the real church as invisible, Newman insisted that Christ’s Body also has institutional dimensions.⁷⁶⁰ This “Communion of Saints” or “Kingdom,”⁷⁶¹ as Newman described it, is inherently sacramental, which inevitably defines the character and structure of justification.⁷⁶²

C. The Sacramental Framework of Justification

Newman assigned instrumental value to the sacraments. Accordingly, “Justification comes *through* the Sacraments; is received *by* faith; *consists* in God’s inward presence; and *lives* in obedience.”⁷⁶³ Against the low-church evangelicals of his day, who tended to regard sacramental instrumentality as a “yoke on the necks of the disciples,” that which “obscures the free grace of the Gospel,”⁷⁶⁴ Newman contends that sacramental rites actually inculcate

⁷⁵⁸ Dessain, *Spirituality*, 67. Newman explains how the atonement is “continually” being applied to the church in *Jfc.*, 202-204 [233-235].

⁷⁵⁹ Newman, *PPS*, 1014. This sermon was published in 1840.

⁷⁶⁰ His sermon, “The Visible Church an Encouragement to Faith,” a message published in 1836, makes this point, *PPS*, 633-643. See also Newman’s sermon “The Communion of Saints” (*ibid.*, 839-849).

⁷⁶¹ Newman understood the church and the Kingdom of God to be synonymous. Flanagan, *Newman, Faith and the Believer*, 285, 311.

⁷⁶² Dessain, *Spirituality*, 54-55.

⁷⁶³ Newman, *Jfc.*, 278 [318].

⁷⁶⁴ This charge cannot be fairly leveled against Luther, despite Newman’s insistence on Luther’s general culpability. Luther maintains that *sola fide* should in no way diminish one’s appreciation for the sacraments. Paul Althaus, *The Theology of Martin Luther* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1966), 349. Robert Bellarmine corroborates this point with respect to Martin Chemnitz and John Calvin, who “teach that faith alone ought not to be opposed to the sacraments in the business of justification, as it is not opposed to the grace of God and the merits of Christ,” (“Nam etiamsi Kemnitius, & Calvinus doceant, solam fidem non debere opponi Sacramentis in negotio iustificationis

Christian faith.⁷⁶⁵ In arguing this case, he cites a catena of biblical examples, including the empowering presence of Angels, Naaman bathing in the Jordan, the Brazen Serpent, and the Mount of Transfiguration.⁷⁶⁶ In each of these instances, divine grace is imparted through a tangible form and effects actual change in the recipient, not simply a legal fiction. From this premise, Newman argues that Protestants fail to understand how justification is properly mediated and manifested, a fact that is betrayed by their inadequate exegesis of St James's teaching on the necessity of "works" in justification.⁷⁶⁷

Controversy surrounding the sacraments was a major reason for Newman's composition of the *Lectures on Justification* (1838). The "Advertisement" to the original edition cites disagreement over their proper form and function, particularly their God-ordained role as instruments of grace, as a primary purpose for delivering the lectures and composing the volume:

The present Volume originated in the following way: It was brought home to the writer from various quarters, that a prejudice existed in many serious minds against certain essential Christian truths, such as Baptismal Regeneration and the Apostolical Ministry, in consequence of a belief that they fostered notions of human merit, were dangerous to the inward life of religion, and incompatible with the doctrine of justifying faith....⁷⁶⁸

It is noteworthy that Newman refers to the issue as consisting of "essential" Christian truths, and that he capitalizes Baptismal Regeneration and Apostolical Ministry. Because these rites emerge from Christ's Incarnation and in some mystical sense possess divine character, they are just that: essential. When Newman reached this conclusion, his doctrine of justification changed drastically, moving from a Calvinist orientation to a growing emphasis on the efficacy of the sacraments.⁷⁶⁹ According to Thomas Sheridan, Newman first went public with

sicut non opponitur gratiae Dei, & merito Christi"). Robert Bellarmine, *De Sacramentis in Genere* 1:22 in *Disputationum De Controversiis Christianae Fidei Tomus Secundus* (Ingolstadt: David Sartorius, 1591), 99-100.

⁷⁶⁵ Newman, *Jfc.*, 280-282 [320-322].

⁷⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, 285-287 [325-327].

⁷⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, 291-293 [331-333].

⁷⁶⁸ John Henry Newman, *Lectures on Justification* (London: Printed for J.G. Rivington; J.H. Parker, 1838), v.

⁷⁶⁹ Sheridan Gilley, "Life and Writings," in *The Cambridge Companion to John Henry Newman*, ed. Ian Ker and Terrance Merrigan (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), 2-3.

this belief in 1828, preaching at St. Mary's on the spiritual influence of baptism.⁷⁷⁰ In the following years, Newman became more confident of his position and by 1833 his theological shift was complete.⁷⁷¹ No longer could "faith alone" exclude sacramental instrumentality.

The challenge for Newman as an Anglican was the Book of Common Prayer's eleventh Article which asserted that "we are justified by *Faith only*," along with the Homily of the Passion for Good Friday which stated "that Faith is the *one mean and instrument* of justification."⁷⁷² Newman accepted these statements at face value, agreeing that genuine faith is the sole instrument by which one is justified over other graces such as love and hope. He then made a further clarification, which had the effect of thwarting the Anglican position of *sola fide*, and, to his thinking, sanctioned the practice of baptismal regeneration: faith, he asserted, is "the sole *internal* instrument, not the sole instrument of any kind."⁷⁷³ Such a distinction is an important underpinning to Newman's doctrine:

There would be nothing inconsistent, then, in Faith being the sole instrument of justification, and yet Baptism also the sole instrument, and that at the same time, because in distinct senses; an inward instrument in no way interfering with an outward instrument. Baptism might be the hand of the giver, and Faith the hand of the receiver. However, this is not the exact relation of Faith to baptism, as is plain for this reason—that Baptism occurs but once, whereas justification is a state, and Faith "abides." Justification, then, needs a perpetual instrument, such as faith can be, and Baptism cannot. Each, then, has its own office in the work of justification; Baptism at the time when it is administered, and faith ever after.⁷⁷⁴

The Anglican Newman was prepared to accept and even use the language of "faith only" as a "lively mode of speech [figurative] for saying that we are justified neither by faith nor by works, but by God only."⁷⁷⁵ He found this usage in Philip Melancthon, in the Homilies, and in Bishop George Bull, for example, but he believed that "it is more suited to the Schools,

⁷⁷⁰ Thomas L. Sheridan, *Newman on Justification: A Theological Biography* (New York: Alba House, 1967), 153-154.

⁷⁷¹ Walgrave, *Newman the Theologian*, 21.

⁷⁷² Newman, *Jfc.*, 223 [256].

⁷⁷³ *Ibid.*, 226 [259].

⁷⁷⁴ *Ibid.*

⁷⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, 244 [279].

than to the taste of a people like the English at the present day.”⁷⁷⁶ Be that as it may, Newman’s interpretation of *sola fide* is a definite departure from the classic formulation, first expressed by Luther, “*propter Christum per fidum*,” a position aimed at safeguarding justification by *iustitia aliena*. In Newman’s vision, faith is more than the means by which one grasps Christ (*fides apprehensiva*);⁷⁷⁷ it represents, rather, a complex set of activities that include the sacraments, love, and obedience. As he puts it:

While then we reserve to Baptism our new birth, and to the Eucharist the ultimate springs of the new life, and to Love what may be called its plastic power, and to Obedience its being the atmosphere in which faith breathes, still the divinity appointed or (in other words) the mysterious virtue of Faith remains. It alone coalesces with the Sacraments, brings them into effect, dissolves (as it were) their outward case, and through them unites the soul to God.⁷⁷⁸

Quoting Hebrews 11:1, Newman defines faith as “the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen.”⁷⁷⁹ This “substance” of faith, according to Newman’s protracted exposition, is predicated on the “unseen” and “hoped for” end, and therefore resists simple definition. In other words, faith remains undefined until it seizes upon its proper object, which, for the Christian, is the living Christ.⁷⁸⁰ For the patient reader, it eventually becomes clear that this is the burden of Newman’s argument: to connect faith with the presence of Christ.⁷⁸¹ Thus, faith is not mere assent of the mind (*assensus*), as the Catholics defined it; nor is it simply trust (*fiducia*) as promulgated by Luther—it is union with Christ.⁷⁸² Whether this union comes through baptism, the inward instrument of faith (following baptism), or by the symbols that represent grace (i.e. obedience and hope), faith

⁷⁷⁶ Ibid., 246-247 [281]. The internal and external distinction of faith is Newman’s second response to those who accused him of violating Article Eleven, after the caveat that justification initiates sanctification.

⁷⁷⁷ Newman explicitly rejects the notion, attributed to Luther, that faith is the “primary instrument” of justification. *Jfc.*, 244 [279].

⁷⁷⁸ Ibid., 236-237 [271].

⁷⁷⁹ Ibid., 252 [288].

⁷⁸⁰ Newman is keen to point out that evil spirits also have faith; therefore, faith must consist in more than mere belief. Ibid., 253-254 [289-290].

⁷⁸¹ Ibid., 266-273 [304-313].

⁷⁸² Ibid.

is manifest communion with Christ.⁷⁸³ After a great deal of parsimony, the closest Newman comes to explicating a positive definition is, “Salvation by faith only is but another way of saying salvation by grace only.”⁷⁸⁴ What may seem unnecessarily opaque and subtle in Newman’s definition, is more intelligible in the light of his doctrine of Justifying Presence.

D. Justifying Presence

To understand how the Sacraments mediate righteousness with a view to manifesting faith and obedience, one must grasp a vital connection between Newman’s doctrine of incarnation and what he calls “Justifying Presence.” Predicated on the conviction that the Living Word became flesh not simply to deliver sinners from guilt (as Newman read Protestantism), nor, on the other extreme, for one to formulate a doctrine of justification “exclusively on the *effects* of grace” apart from a righteous state (as Newman read Catholicism),⁷⁸⁵ Newman begins his *via media* by elevating the justified sinner to fellowship and communion with the Divine.⁷⁸⁶ In this union, the justified receives a gift that *exceeds* the impartation of divine grace, for this one, according to Newman, has received an even greater gift: the very presence of God. The notion is elucidated in Newman’s famous hymn, *Praise to the Holiest in the Height*:

O wisest love! That flesh and blood
Which did in Adam fail,
Should strive afresh against the foe,
Should strive and should prevail;
And that a higher gift than grace
Should flesh and blood refine,
God’s Presence and His very Self,
and Essence all-divine.⁷⁸⁷

⁷⁸³ Ibid., 251 [286].

⁷⁸⁴ Ibid., 283 [324].

⁷⁸⁵ Ibid., 182 [211-212].

⁷⁸⁶ Ibid., 182-188 [211-218].

⁷⁸⁷ John Henry Newman, *Verses on Various Occasions*, New ed. (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1893), 363-364.

Once again, Newman's indebtedness to the Eastern doctrine of theosis is evident. It was early in 1835 when Newman applied this concept specifically to the doctrine of justification in a sermon titled "Human Responsibility." He writes: "The grace of Regeneration. . . is a definite and complete gift conveyed, not gradually, but at once; and it is a state distinct from every other, consisting in the Sacred presence of the Spirit of Christ in soul and body."⁷⁸⁸

When Newman speaks of the Divine Presence, he is explicit about its Trinitarian personhood. So McGrath writes, "The essential feature of Newman's understanding of the nature of justification is his insistence upon the real presence of the Trinity within the soul of the justified believer, conceived in broadly realist terms, which undoubtedly reflects his interest in and positive evaluation of the Greek fathers such as Athanasius."⁷⁸⁹ This is, according to Jose Morales, the "most outstanding merit" of the *Lectures* (1838), the place where "Newman comes face to face with a mystery of faith. . . ."⁷⁹⁰ Such a positive assessment is due to the way Newman correlates the roles to each of the Divine persons in justification and sanctification. Accordingly, the Father declares sinful man to be just, upon the merits and saving grace of Christ, by means of the inhabitation of the Holy Spirit.⁷⁹¹ With this Trinitarian framework in view Newman writes, "This is to be justified, to receive the Divine Presence with us, and be made a Temple of the Holy Ghost."⁷⁹² Such is the heart of Newman's theology of salvation. The God who declares justification and renovates the soul does so by inhabiting the soul:

He justifies us by entering into us, He continues to justify us by remaining in us. *This* is really and truly our justification, not faith, not holiness, not (much less) a mere imputation; but through God's mercy, the very Presence of Christ.⁷⁹³

⁷⁸⁸ Newman, *PPS*, 437. This sermon was published in 1835.

⁷⁸⁹ Alister E. McGrath, *ID*, 297.

⁷⁹⁰ Jose Morales, "Newman and the Problems of Justification," in *Newman Today: Papers Presented at a Conference on John Henry Cardinal Newman*, ed. Stanley L. Jaki, The Proceedings of the Wethersfield Institute 1 (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1989), 146.

⁷⁹¹ Newman, *Jfc.*, 147 [163-164].

⁷⁹² *Ibid.*, 144 [160].

⁷⁹³ *Ibid.*, 150 [167].

Newman recognizes that Scripture describes Divine Presence in various ways: “[Sometimes it is] described as God’s presence or indwelling; sometimes that of Father and Son; sometimes the Holy Ghost; sometimes of Christ the Incarnate Mediator; sometimes of God through the Spirit; sometimes of Christ....”⁷⁹⁴ The common thread among these appellations is Divine inhabitation which results in the justified becoming an adopted son or daughter. Like Christ, who was “justified by the Spirit”⁷⁹⁵ and “declared to be the Son of God with power,”⁷⁹⁶ achieving sonship that “did not supersede but implied His inherent righteousness,”⁷⁹⁷ we also, by virtue of our association with Christ, realize these salvific benefits in concert with the Divine Persons.⁷⁹⁸

Newman’s emphasis comes to flower in Lecture VII where he develops the subject of union with Christ more fully, describing how “justification is the setting up of the Cross within us.”⁷⁹⁹ This chapter, titled “The Characteristics of the Gift of Righteousness,” explores the sanctifying capacity of justification in terms of the adherent presence of Christ, the One who brings the Incarnation, Sacrament, and justifying Presence of God to the human soul.

E. The Christocentric Focus of Justification

Reflecting on how Newman relates the concept of mysterious union with Christ to the sanctifying capacity of justification, Morales offers a helpful summary:

Close consideration of these texts makes it appear that Newman in fact opts for what the theology of the sixteenth century called the doctrine of *double justification*, according to which in order to be true and complete our justice must be completed by that of Jesus Christ, which would come to make up for the deficiencies that the previous sinful condition always leaves in the justified individuals.⁸⁰⁰

⁷⁹⁴ Ibid.

⁷⁹⁵ Ibid., 77 [83]. Newman quoting 1 Tim 3:16.

⁷⁹⁶ Ibid. Newman quoting Rom 1:4.

⁷⁹⁷ Ibid.

⁷⁹⁸ Ibid., 77-78 [83-84].

⁷⁹⁹ Ibid., 173 [200].

⁸⁰⁰ Morales is quite mistaken to suggest that the theology of the sixteenth century had a synoptic view on double justification. As our examination of *Cinquecento* Italy has revealed, positions differed considerably among figures such as Bucer, Calvin, Contarini, Gropper, Pole, Seripando, Valdes, and Vermigli. Morales, "Problems of Justification," 150.

In working out his double righteousness position, Newman traces the logical progression of redemptive history with reference to the judicial and actual dimensions of salvation, particularly as they unfold from the Gospels to the Book of Acts. For example, after developing the Old Testament metaphors of “clothing” and “temple”⁸⁰¹ and the significance of Adamic typology,⁸⁰² Newman explores how these motifs enrich the cruciform shape of justification.⁸⁰³ He makes this argument along the parallel tracks of a forensic and real righteousness, progressing toward the *telos* of justification, which is “the fruit of our Lord’s resurrection.”⁸⁰⁴ It is here, in the *shekinah* presence of God, that one is accepted and renewed on the basis of God’s inward presence, which is simply to say that one is justified.

Newman applies the biblical theme of *shekinah* to illustrate what he means by the salvific gift of God.⁸⁰⁵ For him, this glory denotes an “attribute, property, virtue, or presence of the Divine Nature manifested visibly.”⁸⁰⁶ After establishing the meaning of this presence for salvation and for moral order, as exemplified in the experience of Moses who passed through the Sea (salvation) before arriving at Sinai (moral order), Newman considers the words of Jesus in which the Lord prayed to the Father, “The glory which Thou gavest Me, I have given them.”⁸⁰⁷ Newman then asks, “What is this glory which has passed from Christ to us?”⁸⁰⁸ His answer points to the *glory* of the Father that raised Jesus from the dead.⁸⁰⁹ It is this same glory that justifies sinful humanity. Quoting Paul, he writes: “All have sinned, and come short of,” or *are in need of*, “the *glory* of God.”⁸¹⁰

⁸⁰¹ Newman, *Jfc.*, 155-157 [176-178].

⁸⁰² *Ibid.*, 157-162 [179-185]. Newman’s logic contends that since protology typifies eschatology, the progress of redemption from earthly clothing to heavenly clothing suggest that actual righteousness ought to be central in Christian salvation.

⁸⁰³ *Ibid.*, 170-178 [195-207].

⁸⁰⁴ *Ibid.*, 202 [233]. Newman’s title here reads “Christ’s Resurrection The Source of Justification.”

⁸⁰⁵ *Ibid.*, 156 [177-178].

⁸⁰⁶ *Ibid.*, 162-163 [186].

⁸⁰⁷ *Ibid.*, 163 [187].

⁸⁰⁸ *Ibid.*

⁸⁰⁹ *Ibid.*

⁸¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 164 [188].

Newman proceeds along this redemptive-historical trajectory to introduce the mission of the Holy Spirit as the Gift and the Agent who applies the benefits of Christ's death and resurrection in the form of divine gifts, a complex of blessings that are summarized by the word "Atonement."⁸¹¹ These benefits include pardon, grace, reconciliation, renewal, holiness, and spiritual communion. Newman's point eventually becomes clear—the manner in which the presence of Christ inhabits the justified one is by the Spirit. Once again, the activity of justification, in which the divine members cooperate, is facilitated by Newman's Trinitarian synthesis. After the Son merits salvation, the Holy Spirit applies it through personal inhabitation.

One interesting implication of Newman's synthesis is the way he reads the Old Testament teaching on justification. Prior to Pentecost, when the Mosaic Law governed God's covenant with Israel, the Jewish people enjoyed the *promise* of God's Spirit (e.g. Joel 2, Zech. 12), but they were devoid of actual possession of his Divine Presence.⁸¹² To that point in history, Newman writes, "Judaism was the time of shadows; it was Judaism which contained but the profession, the appearance of great things, exciting hopes which it could not gratify...."⁸¹³ Abraham and Saints of Old were the recipients of "righteousness or acceptableness;"⁸¹⁴ the difference, however, between this and the blessing of the New Covenant, lies in "*what* this righteousness is under the Gospel; or *in what way* this acceptableness is conveyed, whether by a mere act of God's will or by a positive gift on His part?"⁸¹⁵ Newman's definition of the precise nature of this Old Covenant version of "righteousness" or "acceptableness" does not venture beyond these words in his *Lectures*. For that insight, we must look to a message that he preached three years later.

In a sermon from 1841, "Faith the Title for Justification,"⁸¹⁶ Newman begins with the question, "If all that is necessary for acceptance with God be faith in Christ, how is Church

⁸¹¹ Ibid., 202-203 [233-235].

⁸¹² Charles Stephen Dessain, "The Biblical Basis of Newman's Ecumenical Theology," in *The Rediscovery of Newman: An Oxford symposium*, ed. John Coulson and A. M. Allchin (London: Sheed & Ward, 1967), 113.

⁸¹³ Newman, *Jfc.*, 56-57 [61].

⁸¹⁴ Ibid., 192 [223].

⁸¹⁵ Ibid., 193 [223-224].

⁸¹⁶ Newman, *PPS*, 1282-1294. This sermon was published in 1842.

Communion, how are Sacraments, necessary?”⁸¹⁷ He is anxious to affirm the primacy of faith as described by the Apostle Paul, that which legitimately lays claim to justification apart from conditions, while at the same time preserving the obligatory nature of baptism as an instrumental rite. Newman’s attempt to reconcile these positions is predicated on the assertion that “to have a title [i.e. faith] is not the same thing as to be in possession.”⁸¹⁸ In words already cited, the “mere act of God’s will,” which comes by faith, does not equate to his “positive gift,” which comes through baptism. Developing the idea further, Newman continues by asserting that the one “who believes shall to a certainty at some time and by some means be justified.”⁸¹⁹ “Faith,” in this case, “is the means of gaining justification,”⁸²⁰ but justification is unrealized until one undergoes baptism. In this way, Newman seeks to do business with the Pauline texts commonly marshaled on behalf of *sola fide* by reading them as a real, proleptic movement toward justification among Old Covenant believers. However, and this is a profound qualification, *the title or claim of faith does not actually obtain justification until it receives the endowment of the Spirit which is properly realized in baptism.*

As a positive example of this pattern, Newman points to the Apostle Peter who concluded his Pentecost sermon by calling his hearers to be “baptized for remission of their sins and the reception of the Holy Spirit.”⁸²¹ He is also keen to point out how he observes the sacramental emphasis unfolding in later chapters of Acts such as when the Ethiopian eunuch, Paul, and Cornelius and his household underwent baptism. Then, arguing negatively, Newman contends that, “Satan has so disordered Christendom, that numbers perhaps have faith without as yet having justification,”⁸²² a fact that is obvious to him in the meager progress toward sanctification, profanity, pride, despondency, and headstrong blindness to the truth on the part of Christians of his day.

Because Abraham and Saints of Old were deprived of the New Covenant sacrament of baptism, Newman puts them into a special class that carries the “title” for justification,

⁸¹⁷ Ibid., 1282.

⁸¹⁸ Ibid., 1287.

⁸¹⁹ Ibid.

⁸²⁰ Ibid.

⁸²¹ Ibid., 1290.

⁸²² Ibid., 1294.

without truly *possessing* justification, a category that resembles one for whom baptism is unavailable—such as in the catechumen who dies before he is received into the Church, or the believer who undergoes baptism by martyrdom—but who is nevertheless a child of God. The novelty of this position may explain why Newman doesn't address it in detail outside of his 1841 sermon. Nevertheless, an important question to emerge from Newman's soteriological disjunction between the Old and New Covenants is the relationship of Christ and the Holy Spirit in his doctrine of justification.

F. Pneumatic, Resurrected Life

Late in 1834, still in the early stages of the Tractarian Movement, Newman preached a sermon at St. Mary's titled "The Indwelling Spirit." The following quotation from that message sheds light on the way he relates Christ to the Holy Spirit in justification:

This wonderful change from darkness to light, through the entrance of the Spirit into the soul, is called Regeneration, or the New Birth; a blessing which, before Christ's coming, not even Prophets and righteous men possessed, but which is now conveyed to all men freely through the Sacrament of Baptism.⁸²³

When Newman speaks of Christ's presence in the believer, he does so in terms of the Holy Spirit. This is potentially confusing since Newman is emphatic about the Trinitarian shape of divine indwelling, but, as he insists, the pneumatic and the Trinitarian Presence are entirely compatible:⁸²⁴

Here I would observe of this part of the wonderful Economy of Redemption, that God the Son and God the Holy Ghost have so acted together in their separate Persons, as to make it difficult for us creatures always to discriminate what belongs to each respectively.⁸²⁵

Because the divine indwelling of the Holy Spirit brings the saving merits of Christ to one's soul, alien righteousness thereby resides in the believer, and thus serves as the fundamental ground of one's justification.⁸²⁶ Simply put, to have the Spirit is to have Christ, which

⁸²³ Ibid., 368.

⁸²⁴ For a fuller treatment of how Newman correlated the Trinity and the Spirit, see Roderick Strange, *Newman and the Gospel of Christ*, Oxford Theological Monographs (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1981), 153-155.

⁸²⁵ Newman, *Jfc.*, 208 [240].

⁸²⁶ Because Newman insists that adherent righteousness is a form of *gratia increata* which remains distinct from one's soul, some interpreters have described it as an "alien" righteousness. So Joseph S. O'Leary "Impeded Witness: Newman Against Luther on Justification." In *John Henry*

includes the forensic and operative movement of righteousness. The two are integrally linked, just as justification and sanctification are regarded as “substantially one and the same thing.”⁸²⁷

Even though Newman combines justification and sanctification, he nonetheless recognizes an epistemological sequence when he states “in logical order, or exactness of idea, Almighty God justifies before He sanctifies.”⁸²⁸ This follows the traditional Protestant *ordo salutis*. A couple of sentences later Newman specifies the causal relationship of these activities: “to ‘justify’ *means* in itself ‘counting righteous,’ but includes *under* its meaning ‘making righteous;” in other words, the sense of the *term* is ‘counting righteous,’ and the nature of the *thing* denoted by it is making righteous.”⁸²⁹ This explanation allowed Newman to claim subscription to the Thirty-Nine Articles while also following St. Augustine and the Eastern Fathers in their emphasis upon the internal work of the Spirit.⁸³⁰

One figure on whom Newman especially relied at this point was the French historian and patristic scholar of the mid-seventeenth century, Denis Pétau S. J. (1583-1652, or as more commonly known by his Latinized name, Dionysius Petavius) who articulated the Spirit’s substantial indwelling in the human soul.⁸³¹ Thinking with Eastern Fathers such as Cyril of Alexandria, Petavius promoted the notion of the Holy Spirit as the *gratia increata*.⁸³² In the context of a Trinitarian synthesis similar to Newman’s, Petavius defined the work of

Newman: Reason, Rhetoric and Romanticism, edited by David Nicholls and Fergus Kerr. (Bristol: Bristol Press, 1991), 167 and Thomas Holtzen, “Newman’s ‘Via Media’ Theology of Justification” *Newman Studies Journal* 4, no. 2 (2007): 72. Holtzen says of Newman’s position, for instance, that “the *alien* righteousness of Christ exists *internally* as the proper formal cause of justification....” Since Newman, like Vermigli, does not actually use the word “alien,” we have avoided using the term. However, in view of the fact that Newman defines justification as nothing less than “the very Presence of Christ” (Jfc., 150 [167]), there is a sense in which this righteousness is properly “alien.” Thomas Sheridan thus says of Newman’s position, “Our justification, while in us, is not of us.” *Newman on Justification: A Theological Biography*. (New York: Alba House, 1967), 248.

⁸²⁷ Ibid., 63 [67].

⁸²⁸ Ibid., 65 [70].

⁸²⁹ Ibid.

⁸³⁰ Ibid., 64-65 [68-70].

⁸³¹ *Dionysius Petavius*, “De Trinitate,” in *Theologica Dogmata*, ed. F. A. Zacharia (Paris: 1865). On the use of Petavius in Bishop George Bull see Stephen Thomas, *Newman and Heresy: The Anglican Years* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 171-173.

⁸³² Charles Baumgartner, *La grâce du Christ*, Mystère Chrétien: Théologie Dogmatique 10 (Tournai: Desclée & Co., 1963), 190.

the Holy Spirit in terms of a “substantial” indwelling and not a mere “accidental” indwelling.⁸³³ In other words, it is the mission of the Spirit, and not the Father or the Son, to establish himself in the believer. In this respect, Petavius defines indwelling more narrowly than Newman. And yet, in Petavius’s vision, the Spirit also in some sense mediates the life of the Trinity to one’s soul.⁸³⁴

An important implication of the Spirit’s inhabitation is the primacy of *gratia increata* over any form of *gratia creata* or *habitualis*.⁸³⁵ This is precisely where Petavius makes his contribution to Newman’s *Lectures*. In the Advertisement to the Third Edition (1874) Newman writes, “Moreover, Petavius speaks of another, or fifth [form of justification], viz. the substantial Presence of the Holy Ghost in the soul.”⁸³⁶ This presence of the Spirit mediates Christ’s imputed righteousness, which is properly distinguished from one’s own inchoate righteousness.⁸³⁷ This distinction is not intended to denigrate personal virtue. Newman affirms that “the inherent righteousness of a true Christian, viewed as distinct from Christ’s inward presence, is something real, and doubtless far higher than that of a Jew.”⁸³⁸ However, he does sharply distinguish “‘Christ,’ our propitiation, ‘within us’” from one’s actual righteousness.⁸³⁹

When Newman describes the believer’s imperfect, inchoate righteousness he calls it “actual,” for it comes *directly* from the “divinely imparted principle of righteousness.”⁸⁴⁰ While affirming that justification effectively “renews” one’s soul,⁸⁴¹ Newman is emphatic that such renewal is *not* derived from an infusion of inherent righteousness or the cultivation of *habitus*.⁸⁴² Here he quotes Petavius, who “does not scruple to call the Holy

⁸³³ Thomas L. Holtzen, “Union with God and the Holy Spirit: A New Paradigm of Justification” (PhD diss., Marquette University, 2002), 31.

⁸³⁴ Petavius, “De Trinitate,” 453-462.

⁸³⁵ Henri Rondet, *The Grace of Christ: A Brief History of the Theology of Grace* (Westminster, MD.: Newman Press, 1967), 367.

⁸³⁶ Newman, *Jfc.*, xii.

⁸³⁷ *Ibid.*, 349 [395].

⁸³⁸ *Ibid.*, 199-200 [230].

⁸³⁹ *Ibid.*, 200 [231].

⁸⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, 351 [397].

⁸⁴¹ *Ibid.*, 86 [93].

⁸⁴² *Ibid.*, 348-352 [394-398].

Ghost the formal cause of the righteousness imparted to us.”⁸⁴³ The cause of justification is, in Newman’s terms, “adherent” righteousness, “depending wholly and absolutely on the Divine Indwelling.”⁸⁴⁴ Simply stated, “Justifying righteousness consists in the coming and presence of the Holy Ghost within us.”⁸⁴⁵

Given Newman’s stress on imputed righteousness (in the form of Divine Indwelling), and not the production of a created habit as the proper ground of justification, one might expect for him to have a doctrine of assurance. Of course, this is where Vermigli and Reformed theology go, with their emphasis on imputation. For Newman, however, there is no forward-looking assurance since he espouses an increasing *development* of justification. How can justification by divine indwelling be increased? Newman answers, “Righteousness then, considered as the state of being God’s temple, cannot be increased; but, considered as the divine glory which that state implies, it can be increased.”⁸⁴⁶ How exactly one’s righteous state is related to the operation of righteousness is in some respects the million dollar question. For that answer we must consider the formal cause of justification in Newman’s doctrine.

G. The Formal Cause of Justification

Before examining how Newman defines the formal cause of justification, we will summarize the basic contours of his position. For starters, Newman raises the topic with a valuable question concerning the believer’s union with Christ:

Again: if it be laid down that our justification consists in union with Christ, or reconciliation with God, this is an intelligible and fair answer; and then the question will arise, what is *meant* by union with Christ?⁸⁴⁷

For Newman, this Christological union comes to one’s soul by the Holy Spirit, who properly imputes the righteousness of Christ by means of divine indwelling. This “adherent” righteousness is distinguished from an “inherent,” “infused,” or a “habitual” deposit of justice in that the former consists in the personal inhabitation of the Triune God. Of the

⁸⁴³ Ibid., 352 [398].

⁸⁴⁴ Ibid., 187 [218].

⁸⁴⁵ Ibid., 139 [155].

⁸⁴⁶ Ibid., 151 [168].

⁸⁴⁷ Ibid., 134 [148].

three Divine Persons, the Holy Spirit is explicated as the proper agent of justification as a matter of his own role (*proprium*) in the economy of salvation,⁸⁴⁸ although strict lines of differentiation between members of the Godhead are not drawn. Thus, divine indwelling is the *gratia increata* upon which one is declared righteous. In connection with this, Newman summarizes what he considers to be the proper formal cause of justification: “This is really and truly our justification, not faith, not holiness, not (much less) a mere imputation; but through God’s mercy, the very Presence of Christ.”⁸⁴⁹

In addition to a “proper” formal cause of justification, Newman also posits an “improper” formal cause.⁸⁵⁰ Accordingly, when the justifying merits of Christ are imparted to an individual by Divine Indwelling, a real, actual righteousness is simultaneously operative.⁸⁵¹ This inchoate or incipient righteousness belongs to the Christian and in this sense may be called “inherent.” A metaphor that Newman commonly employs to convey this notion is “shekinah”—the salvific gift of God that is an “attribute, property, virtue, or presence of the Divine Nature manifested visibly.”⁸⁵² It is here where Newman closely resembles Augustine, a connection that Newman himself often makes when he describes the active, fruit-bearing quality of righteousness.⁸⁵³ Therefore, in view of this improper formal cause, Newman states, “to ‘justify’ *means* in itself ‘counting righteous,’ but includes *under* its meaning ‘making righteous;’” in other words, the sense of the *term* is ‘counting righteous,’ and the nature of the *thing* denoted by it is making righteous.”⁸⁵⁴

One way to describe Newman’s position on justification is in terms of a two-fold righteousness: imputed *and* actual, although such a distinction is intended to be logical and not temporal. The strength of this formulation, as is commonly true of *duplex iustitia*, is its appreciation for a forensic action based upon righteousness while also taking seriously the need for faith to be formed by love. In Newman’s words, it is the simultaneous movements

⁸⁴⁸ Newman, *PPS*, xi, 10, 1270. These sermons were published between 1834-1843.

⁸⁴⁹ Newman, *Jfc.*, 150 [167].

⁸⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, xi, 337 [386], 381-82 [423-425], 392 [425-426].

⁸⁵¹ *Ibid.*, 199-200 [230].

⁸⁵² *Ibid.*, 162-163 [186].

⁸⁵³ *Ibid.*, 58-61, 64-65 [52-55, 68-70]. Newman usually refers to Augustine as “Saint Austin.”

⁸⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, 65 [69-70].

of “pardon and renovation.”⁸⁵⁵ Such a construction seeks to avoid legal fiction, bringing the Protestant categories of justification and sanctification into a closer relationship. The precise nature of this connection, with specific reference to its formal cause, will now be examined.

In the original 1838 version of his *Lectures*, Newman located the formal cause of justification in the imputation of righteousness. He made this point by emphasizing forensic imputation by divine indwelling as the proper formal cause of his *via media*.⁸⁵⁶ “Justification tends to sanctify;”⁸⁵⁷ “in logical order, or exactness of idea, Almighty God justifies before He sanctifies.”⁸⁵⁸ The Catholic Newman retained these statements in his Third Edition (1874), but qualified them when he shifted emphasis to the one internal formal cause, a shift that he explicates in his “Advertisement to the Third Edition” when he writes: “The first of these [changes from the First Edition] is the proposition that more than one formal cause can be assigned to the justified state.”⁸⁵⁹

By the year 1874, Newman had switched the formal cause to a form of internal righteousness: “And so far as the author of these Lectures contradicts this categorical statement, he now simply withdraws what he has said in them. But he was mistaken if he supposed that it was thereby determined *what* the “*unica forma*” really was, or again that there might not be more *forms* than one (whether improper *forms*, or *forms* of the justifying justice or renovation). . . .”⁸⁶⁰ The reason why Newman feels free to make this alteration without revising his overall position is because he regards Trent to be ambiguous on the precise nature of the *unica forma causa*:

Though, then, there be but one formal cause (and there never can be more than one proper form of anything), still it is not settled precisely what that form is. We are at liberty to hold that it is not the renewed state of the soul, but the Divine gift which renews it.⁸⁶¹

⁸⁵⁵ Ibid., 101 [112].

⁸⁵⁶ Newman, *Jfc.*, 1st ed., 386, 427.

⁸⁵⁷ Ibid., 95.

⁸⁵⁸ Ibid., 70.

⁸⁵⁹ Newman, *Jfc.*, x-xi.

⁸⁶⁰ Ibid.

⁸⁶¹ Ibid., xi.

In the “Advertisement” to the Third Edition (1874) of his *Lectures*, Newman supports his case by introducing several post-Tridentine Catholic voices on the doctrine of justification. He starts with Bellarmine, who acknowledges that it is an open question as to whether righteousness consists in grace or charity and who, according to Newman, “allows that there are theologians who think otherwise.”⁸⁶² Pallavicino, the second example, allowed for a mixture of grace and charity. Likewise, Vasquez posited two possible forms. Third was Sporer who held to two “partial” forms, an external divine act and an internal work, the former defined as *favor Dei*, the latter as *habitus iustitiae*. Bellarmine is mentioned again, as a fourth option, with regard to the Council’s emphasis on *esse fidem charitate formatam*. Fifth and most significant for its proximity to Newman’s position is Petavius who argued for the “substantial Presence of the Holy Ghost in the soul.”⁸⁶³ From this Newman unfolded his argument that the formal cause of justification is the Spirit who brings the divine presence to one’s soul and who in turn stimulates actual righteousness as the improper form of the soul’s righteousness.

Newman’s question of whether the teaching of Trent unequivocally defined the *unica formalis causa* of justification in terms of *habitus* grows out of his relative discomfort with grounding justification squarely upon created grace. His concern, once again, is that *gratia inhaerens* in terms of mere renewal suggests that justification is reduced to a matter of obedience and meritorious works, which he believes to have the pastorally disastrous effect of leading one toward unhealthy introspection.⁸⁶⁴ “Hence,” says Newman, “the charge against Romanism, not unfounded as regards its popular teaching, that it views the influence of grace, not as the operations of a living God, but as a something to bargain about, and buy, and traffic with....”⁸⁶⁵ The fact that Newman retained this sentence after becoming a Catholic underscores his continued uneasiness with building justification upon the sole ground of *gratia creata*.⁸⁶⁶

⁸⁶² Ibid.

⁸⁶³ Ibid., xii.

⁸⁶⁴ Ibid., 190 [220].

⁸⁶⁵ Ibid., 186 [163].

⁸⁶⁶ Newman qualifies this statement in a footnote, “It requires a considerable acquaintance with the working of the Catholic system to have the right thus to speak of it.” Ibid., 186.

Newman's contention, however, goes further than the Church's "popular teaching." In the Appendix of the Third Edition (1874) of his *Lectures* he dedicates 61 pages to the question of justification's formal cause.⁸⁶⁷ In the opening footnote of the first page he writes:

The purpose of this Appendix is to show that the cardinal question to be considered by Catholics and Protestants in their controversy about Justification is, What is its *formal cause*? When this is properly examined, it will be found that there is little or no difference of view between the disputants....⁸⁶⁸

Newman's Appendix provides valuable historical background to the arguments contained in his *Lectures* (1838). For much of the Appendix, Newman's analysis concentrates on the controversies of the sixteenth century when Catholics opposed Luther's "justification by faith alone" by citing Galatians 5:6, "*fides quae per caritatem operatur*," which was then translated into Aristotelian categories as "*fides caritate formata*." This history of interpretation vis-à-vis the formal cause of justification is then traced through subsequent history, including the Caroline Divines and eventually into his own day. The appendix supports the lectures with valuable historical background, but it does not advance substantive arguments beyond that which is postulated in the lectures themselves.

Thomas L. Sheridan S. J. rightly indicates that the two seminal chapters of the *Lectures* are found in the sixth and seventh lectures.⁸⁶⁹ They are instructive for understanding Newman's formal cause, especially if one compares the First (1838) and Third (1874) Editions. In the First Edition, Newman emphasized that renewal followed as an extension from justification; in the Third Edition (1874) he stressed that these were identical. Writing in the very center of these chapters—in the closing words of chapter six before starting chapter seven—Newman explains:⁸⁷⁰

Lastly, we may now see what the connexion really is between justification and renewal.

⁸⁶⁷ The First Edition of Newman's *Lectures* (1838) also contained an appendix titled "On the formal cause of Justification" [Newman, *Jfc.*, 1st ed., 391-443]. At 52 pages in length, there are no substantive changes to the Third Edition apart from explanatory notes that appear on pages 343, 348-349, and 353.

⁸⁶⁸ Newman, *Jfc.*, 343.

⁸⁶⁹ "On the Gift of Righteousness," and "The Characteristics of the Gift of Righteousness." These titles are the same in both versions of the *Lectures*. See *ibid.*, 130-154; 155-178; [143-175; 176-207].

⁸⁷⁰ Newman's First Edition has a four page "Note on Lecture VI" (*Jfc.*, 1st ed., 172-175.), which examines his thesis from the *Homilies*. Drawing continuity with Anglicanism is less of a concern for the Catholic Newman.

First Edition (1838)

I have said above, that God's declaring us righteous renews us, as in the beginning He spake the Word, and the world was created; but *how* renewal *followed on justification* (emphasis added) did not appear.

Of course, all that is said on this subject must be a mystery after all; yet so much we may now say, that if the justifying Word be attended by the spiritual entrance of Christ in the soul, justification is perfectly distinct from renewal, with which the Roman Schools identify it, yet directly productive of it, which strict Protestants deny.

The latter say that renewal is a collateral result with justification from faith; the former say that it precedes justification. Rather Christ's sacred Presence, which shines forth in the heart straight upon the word of justification, creates a renewal there as certainly as a light involves illumination or fire heat. And on the other hand, since quenching this renovating Presence necessarily leads to its departure, renewal may be considered the condition on our part as well as the result of justification.

The word of justification *is* (emphasis added) the substantive living Word of God, entering the soul, illuminating and cleansing it, as fire brightens and purifies material substances.

He who justifies also sanctifies, because it is He.

Third Edition (1874)

They are both included in that one great gift of God, the indwelling of Christ in the Christian soul.

The indwelling is *ipso facto* our justification and sanctification, as its necessary results.

It is the Divine Presence that justifies us, not faith, as say the Protestant school, nor renewal, as say the Roman.

The first blessing runs into the second as its necessary limit; and the second being rejected carries away with it the first. And the one cannot be separated from the other except in idea, unless the sun's rays can be separated from the sun, or the power of the purifying from water.⁸⁷¹

In summarizing the development of Newman's synthesis, Sheridan points out that "to the extent that Newman's thought developed away from Evangelicalism, his conception of grace became more ecclesial."⁸⁷² The above comparison is an example of this movement. Accordingly, what started as internal renewal *derived* from Divine Indwelling (First Edition, 1838) became a *unica forma causa* with renewal at the very center. In this sense, Newman's *via media* evolved into a *via Romana*. But did it evolve to such an extent that he can be said to have jettisoned his middle way, or is it simply that Newman moved closer to the Roman position?

What makes this question so vexing is that Newman's *Lectures* are essentially the same from his First (1838) to his Third Edition (1874). Most of his statements on the relationship of justification and renewal remain unchanged in the latter edition, leading one to conclude that his position is likewise unchanged. Then one reads a piece by the Catholic Newman, such as the above segment from the Third Edition (1874), which reflects a clear difference (leaving behind a logical sequence between justification and renewal to draw an essential continuity between them), and the question reasserts itself. Perhaps insight can be realized by identifying other areas of development (or outright disagreement) between the Anglican and the Catholic Newman. In what follows we shall explore a few examples.

One place in the *Lectures* in which Newman the Roman Catholic clearly disagreed with Newman the Anglo-Catholic was on the subject of sin and the justified. In the Third Edition (1874), he qualifies the following statement: "For we must consider that since we are ever falling into sin and incurring God's wrath, we are ever being justified again and again by His grace."⁸⁷³ With regard to "ever falling into sin and incurring God's wrath," Newman includes a footnote: "This is incorrect. If by 'sin' is meant grievous sin, those who

⁸⁷¹ Newman, *Jfc.*, 154 [170-171].

⁸⁷² Sheridan, *Newman on Justification*, 242. In context, Sheridan is concerned with illustrating the centrality of baptism. Elsewhere Sheridan makes this same point with regard to Newman's position on faith alone, "As a matter of fact, in the third edition (1874) he [Newman] simply denied it [the instrumentality of faith alone], albeit merely in a footnote. "Catholics hold that, not faith only, but faith, hope, and charity, are the 'sustaining causes of justification.'" Ibid., 255.

⁸⁷³ Newman, *Jfc.*, 101.

are in the grace of God need not ever be falling into it; and if lighter sins are meant, these do not bring us back again under 'God's wrath.'"⁸⁷⁴

Similarly, Newman's Third Edition (1874) retracts a statement with regard to the "perfect" state of righteousness among those who are justified:

[The justified are "perfect"] in relation to the past, as being a simple reversal of the state of guilt, and a bringing into God's favour; but as God's favour towards us will grow as we become more holy, so as we become more holy, we may receive a higher justification. The words in the text are inconsistent with an increase of justification, which Catholics hold.⁸⁷⁵

Remembering that such notes were written 29 years after Newman converted to Catholicism, it is not very surprising to find him conforming earlier statements to Catholic dogma.⁸⁷⁶ Owing to the fact that justification and sanctification are one, and that the latter grows in meritorious works (performed by grace), it is logical for Newman to envisage the gradual increase of justification.⁸⁷⁷ So he asserts that the gift of righteousness "then is habitual; both permanent and increasing."⁸⁷⁸ More specifically, he writes:

[The] Gift which justifies us is, as we have seen, a something distinct from us and lodged in us, yet it involves in its idea its own work in us, and (as it were) takes up into itself that renovation of the soul, those holy deeds and sufferings, which are as if a radiance streaming from it.⁸⁷⁹

It is at this point that Jose Morales cries foul. The problem consists in the fact that Newman seeks to preserve a ground of justification that is defined by the absolute perfection of the Triune God, and, at the same time, he asserts that this righteousness becomes a human possession which grows in a real and proper sense. Expressing his contention, Morales quotes from Newman's sermon, "Righteousness, Not of Us, but in Us," (1840) where actual righteousness is said to be "not merely given to us and imputed to us, but really implanted in us by the operation of the Blessed Spirit."⁸⁸⁰ Morales then concludes, "The vocabulary used by Newman henceforth clearly suggests the idea of *inherent* justice, [language] which

⁸⁷⁴ *ibid.*

⁸⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, 73.

⁸⁷⁶ See chapters 7, 10-11, and 16 in Norman P. Tanner, *Decrees*, 673-676; 677-678.

⁸⁷⁷ Newman, *Jfc.*, 151-152 [168-169].

⁸⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, 164 [188].

⁸⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, 178 [207].

⁸⁸⁰ Morales, "Problems of Justification," 157.

he avoided in the *Lectures*.⁸⁸¹ And again, from the *Discourses*, Morales quotes Newman, "When God, for Christ's sake, is about to restore any one to His favour, His first act of mercy is to impart to him a portion of His grace."⁸⁸²

Here again we see that Newman's position is basically compatible with St. Augustine's. As such, the cultivation of virtue happens actively *in nobis* and not passively *extra nos*, which then gives rise to the development of *charitas*,⁸⁸³ or in Newman's terminology, "actual righteousness."⁸⁸⁴ This is one reason why Newman was able to reissue his *Lectures* (1874) as a Catholic 36 years after their original publication: because his position was in fundamental agreement with Augustinian soteriology in the first place (although expressed in different terms).⁸⁸⁵

Morales suggests that after 1840 Newman's "dialectic approach, which prompted the establishment of a forced symmetry between Protestantism and Romanism," began to disappear.⁸⁸⁶ Charles Dessain offers a similar assessment when he writes, "On becoming a Catholic, however, Newman wrote little on the subject of Uncreated Grace."⁸⁸⁷ Sheridan recognizes that Newman's doctrine of justification moved with him to Rome, especially with regard to baptism and faith, but he does not address the question of whether this also applies to the concept of uncreated grace.⁸⁸⁸ Thomas Holtzen, on the other hand, disagrees with this view, particularly with Morales's contention that "Newman increasingly dwells on

⁸⁸¹ Ibid.

⁸⁸² Ibid.

⁸⁸³ Augustine, "The Spirit and the Letter," 26:45 in *Augustine: Later Works*, ed. John Burnaby, The Library of Christian Classics 8 (London: SCM Press, 1955), 228-229.

⁸⁸⁴ Newman, *Jfc.*, 80 [86].

⁸⁸⁵ Newman writes in the Appendix of the Third Edition, "However, a few words of explanation are called for here in relation to two propositions of the Volume, which he distinctly professed to be at variance, but (as he now believes) are not really at variance, with the doctrines held in the Roman schools of recent times on the subject of justification." Ibid., x.

⁸⁸⁶ Instead, Newman posits the diametric opposition of Protestantism and Pelagianism instead of a *via media* between Protestantism and Romanism. See Morales, "Problems of Justification," 155.

⁸⁸⁷ Charles Stephen Dessain, "Cardinal Newman and the Doctrine of Uncreated Grace," *The Clergy Review* 47 (1962): 285.

⁸⁸⁸ Sheridan, *Newman on Justification*, 255.

created grace as the cause of justification.”⁸⁸⁹ Holtzen gives three reasons why he believes Newman’s *via media* by uncreated grace stands, even after reissuing the Third Edition (1874) of his *Lectures*.

Because: (1) he adds an appendix that asserts the Holy Spirit is the formal cause of justification after his conversion, (2) he therein asserts the Holy Spirit is the proper form of justification and actual righteousness is the improper form, (3) he explicitly rejects the notion of *habitus* that accompanies the idea of *gratia creata*.⁸⁹⁰

Holtzen’s argument is flawed. First, he is evidently under the wrong impression that Newman introduced his Appendix in the Third Edition (1874) when in fact the Appendix was present from the start.⁸⁹¹ A look at the First Edition (1838) reveals that they are essentially the same, including the title, “On the Formal Cause of Justification.”⁸⁹² This makes the first of his three arguments a moot point. As for his second point, Holtzen is correct to point out that Newman continues to assert that the Holy Spirit is the proper form of justification and actual righteousness is the improper form, however Holtzen doesn’t account for the above-mentioned section in the *Lectures* where Newman moves off of his *via media* script to emphasize one formal internal cause in terms of internal renewal.⁸⁹³ Finally, while Newman disavows *habitus* as the necessary accompaniment to *gratia creata*, he comes close to it when he acknowledges that infusion of an inherent righteousness is the formal ground of justification: “In this then I conceive to lie the unity of Catholic doctrine on the subject of justification, that we are saved by Christ’s imputed righteousness, and by our own inchoate righteousness at once.”⁸⁹⁴ Holtzen acknowledges this fact when he writes, “[In the Third Edition, Newman switched] his understanding of the formal cause of justification from the

⁸⁸⁹ Holtzen, “Union with God,” 183. For a more recent treatment by Holtzen in which he argues that Newman’s theology of justification is a true *via media* between Roman Catholicism and Protestantism see Thomas L. Holtzen, “Newman’s ‘Via Media’ Theology of Justification,” *Newman Studies Journal* 4, no. 2 (Fall 2007): 64-74.

⁸⁹⁰ Holtzen, “Union with God,” 178.

⁸⁹¹ *Ibid.* Holtzen cites three alterations to the Third Edition of Newman’s *Lectures*. In addition to a movement toward inherent righteousness and the addition of sixteen explanatory notes, he points out the “addition of an extensive sixty-one page appendix on the formal cause of justification.” Holtzen’s confusion is perhaps due to the initial footnote of the Appendix which may give the impression that it was a subsequent addition (Newman, *Jfc.*, 343). However, it is the footnote that was added to the *Lectures*, not the Appendix itself.

⁸⁹² Newman, *Jfc.*, 343 [391].

⁸⁹³ *Ibid.*, 154 [170-171].

⁸⁹⁴ *Ibid.*, 368 [414].

imputation of an alien righteousness to the infusion of an inherent righteousness.”⁸⁹⁵

Newman may not call this inherent righteousness “*habitus*,” but what he says about it in terms of its capacity to grow, even describing it in terms of “habitual,”⁸⁹⁶ certainly gives the impression that it is something like *habitus* that he has in mind.

H. Conclusion

If in Tract 90 (1841) the Anglican Newman overreached his claim of solidarity with Rome, it may be that in the Third Edition (1874) of his *Lectures* the Catholic Newman gives the appearance of having retained more unity with his Anglican *via media* than was actually the case. It would certainly be wrong to suggest that Newman left his Anglican position in “shreds and tatters”—Newman’s words from his autobiographical memoir to describe the state of his Calvinism when he had left Evangelicalism decades earlier;⁸⁹⁷ but that his *via media* developed into a *via Romana* appears to have been the case.

Whether the Catholic Newman eventually rested his doctrine of justification on the formal cause of created grace is inconclusive. If one concentrates on the majority of Newman’s *Lectures*, which reach back to 1838, the answer is “no.” If, however, one gives priority to the sections that the Catholic Newman added, especially in light of his wider life and ministry, as Morales contends, the answer is probably “yes.” More conclusive is the fact that by 1874 Newman’s *via media* had become fully Roman, albeit an unconventional sort that leveraged the semantic range of the *unica forma causa* to emphasize a real sense of imputation and also an internal righteousness, both growing out of the Divine Presence. This is Newman’s formal cause, in his words:

[Justification] viewed relatively to the past is forgiveness of sin [a real imputation], for nothing more it can be; but considered as to the present and future it is more, it is renewal wrought in us by the Spirit of Him who by His merits completes what is defective in that renewal [real inherent righteousness].”⁸⁹⁸

⁸⁹⁵ Holtzen, “Union with God,” 178.

⁸⁹⁶ Newman, *Jfc.*, 164 [188].

⁸⁹⁷ John Henry Newman, *Letters and Correspondence of John Henry Newman During His Life in the English Church : With a Brief Autobiography*, ed. Anne Mozley, New impression. ed. (London: Longmans, Green, 1903), 106.

⁸⁹⁸ Newman, *Jfc.*, 36 [38].

In this sense, Newman's position may be called a *duplex iustitia*. In the next chapter, we shall compare and contrast this position with that of Peter Martyr Vermigli and other proponents of two-fold righteousness.

Chapter Five

A Comparison of Newman and Vermigli on the Doctrine of Justification

A. Newman and Vermigli in Conversation

We have thus far recognized similarities between Newman and Vermigli, along with many differences. With regard to the former, we have noted that despite three centuries of distance, their doctrines of justification were motivated by similar concerns. These include the danger of meritorious works, cheap grace, and a proper relationship between forensic and actual righteousness. They also possess common theological commitments, notably an Augustinian hamartology, union with Christ, the need for a forensic imputation, the internal renewal of the Holy Spirit, and *duplex iustitia*. Most interesting and significant is the fact that the Catholic Newman maintains forensic imputation and that the Protestant Vermigli upholds the Spirit's work of renewal, issuing forth in good works, under the rubric of justification. The term *duplex iustitia* has served as a way to describe these anomalies.

Probing more deeply into their respective positions, we have also observed how Newman and Vermigli give attention to many of the same sources. They are both biblical exegetes, rock-ribbed in their commitment to the authority of Scripture. This is especially apparent in Vermigli's work, where he explores Hebrew and Greek etymology.⁸⁹⁹ Of course, the genre of Martyr's *locus*, embedded in his commentary on *Romans*, encourages such analyses. But it must be acknowledged that Newman is no exegetical slouch. Even though his *Lectures* were intended to be more systematic in their scope and sequence, he does not hesitate to examine the meaning of words in their biblical context.⁹⁰⁰

Newman and Vermigli also give considerable attention to non-biblical sources, particularly church Fathers and councils.⁹⁰¹ The outstanding difference in their use of these

⁸⁹⁹ Vermigli specifically focuses on the terms "justification" and "faith," *Romanos*, 1181-1183 [87-89]. For more on Martyr's humanistic method of biblical interpretation see Marvin Anderson, "Peter Martyr Vermigli: Protestant Humanist," in *Peter Martyr Vermigli and Italian Reform*, ed. J.C. McLelland (Waterloo, Ontario: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1980), 65-84.

⁹⁰⁰ Newman writes, "I say, then, that the words of Scripture, as of every other book, have their own meaning, which must be sought in order to be found." *Jfc*, 118. (e.g., 151, 170).

⁹⁰¹ In his *Romans locus*, (far more than in his *Genesis* and *1 Corinthians Loci*), Vermigli devotes significant attention to the fathers and church councils. This attention is concentrated at the conclusion of each of the three propositions, 1237-1253 [143-160], 1297-1311 [202-218], 1316-1324 [221-230].

sources largely consists of Newman's heavy reliance on the Eastern Fathers, his interaction with Luther, and his references to the Caroline Divines (who of course followed Vermigli by the better part of a century). While it is true that Vermigli's doctrine of *sola scriptura* leads him to use the Fathers and church councils largely as a means of supporting the authority of Scripture, he is, like Newman, concerned to prove his doctrine from the broader Christian tradition, that is, so long as Scripture is assigned the priority.⁹⁰² When this order is confused, however, as Martyr perceived to be the case among his interlocutors, he objects in forceful terms. Thus, he writes: "We have certain adversaries who judge little or nothing at all on the basis of the Holy Scriptures, but measure all their religion by the Fathers and councils, so much that they can be called *Patrologi* instead of *Theologi*."⁹⁰³ With regard to church councils, Vermigli asserts that they "should not be heard without selectivity and judgment. We ought to receive and reverence only those councils which have kept their doctrine within the rule of Holy Scriptures."⁹⁰⁴ Newman would agree with this notion in principle, although he spends less time trying to biblically chasten conciliar statements.

Newman and Vermigli also have *differences* in their doctrines of justification. This is especially true concerning other sets of theological commitments and the conclusions which logically follow from them. Such commitments include the sacramental framework of justification and *sola fide*. The theological outworking of these commitments bring Newman and Vermigli to contrasting conclusions, most significantly on justification's formal cause, *habitus*, and the doctrine of perseverance.

In this chapter we trace the lines of continuity and difference between Newman's and Vermigli's doctrines. We begin each section with Newman's thought as a point of departure, since his position is relatively more complex, examining the essence of his thought on a given topic, before contrasting it with Vermigli's position, followed by a brief

⁹⁰² Vermigli, *Romanos*, 1236-1251 [143-158]. For example, to support his argument that the unregenerate cannot be justified by work he cites Basil, Gregory of Nazianzus, Augustine, Chrysostum, Ambrose, Cyprian and Origen.

⁹⁰³ Ibid., 1236 [143]: "Sed quoniam quosdam habemus adversarios, qui aut parum, aut nihil a scripturis pendeant, omnem autem suam pietatem, Patribus, et Concilijs metiantur, ut magis Patrologi, quam Theologi dici possint." Those who commit this error are said to "easily obscure the truth" (Ibid.).

⁹⁰⁴ Ibid., 1245-1247 [152-155]. Because Vermigli's central concern is the problem of Pelagianism, he cites councils that explicitly renounce it, namely Milevis (A.D. 416) and the Second Council of Orange (A.D. 529).

summary. With such perspective, we will be poised to reflect on contemporary implications for dialogue at the Roman Catholic and Reformed Protestant intersection, which follows this chapter in the overall conclusion of the thesis.

Common Concerns

B. WORKS RIGHTEOUSNESS

Newman and Vermigli both opposed the notion of works righteousness. From Newman's perspective, Roman Catholic soteriology was vulnerable to this critique. Citing the reason for this vulnerability, Newman opines: "they do not discern, they do not believe in, anything else [besides 'obedience'] in which [justification] can consist."⁹⁰⁵ This led Newman to criticize the Roman Catholic position for reducing the ground of justification to a "habit" of obedience.⁹⁰⁶ Such an approach, he argues, easily makes the mistake of replacing a properly Christ-centered vision with unhealthy introspection (*incurvatus in se*).⁹⁰⁷

In a similar vein, Newman regarded the doctrine of *gratia inhaerens* as unwittingly reducing justification to a matter of meritorious works, a move that he considered detrimental to the development of personal faith.⁹⁰⁸ Concern for the practical liabilities of meritorious works vis-à-vis unhealthy introspection, it turns out, was shared by Peter Martyr:

Certainly no one understands except those who have experienced how difficult it is for a bruised heart, dejected and weary with the burden of sins to find comfort. . . . If we, like the Sophists, commanded a person to have regard for his own works, then he would never find comfort, would always be tormented, always in doubt of his salvation and finally, be swallowed up with desperation.⁹⁰⁹

In addition to cautioning against the danger of falling in "desperation" beneath the righteousness requirement of God, Vermigli and Newman also identified the tendency toward impersonal worship in the Catholic tradition. For instance, Newman viewed much of popular Romanism as promoting a sort of religious transaction, an exchange of "the [mere]

⁹⁰⁵ Newman, *Jfc*, 183 [160].

⁹⁰⁶ *Ibid.*, 348-352 [394-398].

⁹⁰⁷ *Ibid.*, 190 [220].

⁹⁰⁸ *Ibid.*

⁹⁰⁹ Vermigli, *Romanos*, 1208 [114].

influence of grace, not as the operations of a living God, but as something to bargain about, and buy, and traffic....”⁹¹⁰ Peter Martyr also addressed what he regarded as the impersonal nature of the Roman Catholic system when he contrasts the ritualistic function of the Petrine “keys” with the preaching of the word, appropriated by personal faith.⁹¹¹ He writes, “[When Christ was at dinner with the Pharisees] he exhorted them to first purify the heart, which is inward. This is something done by faith, for it is written in Acts, ‘by faith cleansing their hearts.’”⁹¹²

Regarding the “grace of eternal life,” Peter Martyr asserts that “what is given freely, excludes merit completely.”⁹¹³ In contradiction to his doctrine is the “Pelagian” view of the Roman Church which he understood to effectively undermine divine grace by including human merit in the ground of justification.⁹¹⁴ Newman does not employ the specific language of “Pelagianism” to describe the problem of works righteousness, but he shares Vermigli’s fundamental concern with reference to grounding justification in human merit.⁹¹⁵ However, by the time Newman wrote the *Third Edition* of his *Lectures*—29 years after converting to Catholicism—he had retreated from this concern:

This school is elsewhere called in these Lectures ultra-Roman or extreme Romanist. Such Catholic divines as Caietan, Vasquez, and Bellarmine were intended by this title, who, by making justification consist in the habit of charity or again in good works, not in sanctifying grace as an initial and distinct gift from above, seemed to the writer to fix the mind, equally with Anglican Arminians, not on a Divine inward Presence vouchsafed to it, but on something of its own, as a ground to rest upon and take satisfaction in. *Of course, such a judgment seems to him now unreal and arbitrary.*⁹¹⁶

⁹¹⁰ Newman, *Jfc.*, 186-187 [216-217].

⁹¹¹ Vermigli, *Romanos*, 1234-35 [141-142].

⁹¹² *Ibid.*, 1234-35 [141-142].

⁹¹³ *Ibid.*, 1290 [197]. Elsewhere Vermigli writes, “Therefore, we must take away all merit, not only in those who are not yet justified, but also in those who have been justified” (1288 [195]).

⁹¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 1248-49 [156]. As noted, Vermigli’s portrayal of Trent’s position vis-à-vis Pelagianism, is less than fair. Chapter eight of the Council’s *Decree on Justification* explicitly states that justification comes as a “free gift,” and does so on the perennial consent of the Catholic Church, on the basis of faith, “without which ‘it is impossible to please God’” (Heb 11:6). *Decree on Justification*, ch. 8 in N.P. Tanner, *Decrees*, 2:674.

⁹¹⁵ Newman, *Jfc.*, 147 [163-164].

⁹¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 190 [statement contained in Footnote 1 of the *Third Edition*, absent from the 1838 version]. Emphasis added.

Newman and Vermigli may describe the problem of meritorious works with different language and identify its tendencies in different parts of the church, but they stand together in opposing human merit as a fundamental ground of justification.

C. CHEAP GRACE

Since Newman read the Evangelicals of his day as maintaining justification by *mere* imputation, he sought to show the integral connection of justification and renewal.⁹¹⁷ As we have observed, Newman's bone of contention was not with "imputation" strictly speaking, as much as a *reduction* of the doctrine of justification to imputation.⁹¹⁸ The reason for the Evangelicals' error, according to Newman, was the popular belief in justification by *sola fide*, which he regarded as a direct route to antinomianism.⁹¹⁹ Newman suggests that this tendency is evidenced in the typical Evangelical exegesis of St. James concerning the necessity of works in justification, a teaching that Newman finds wholly inadequate.⁹²⁰

Vermigli recognizes the possibility that justification by faith alone can become a form of cheap grace. At the beginning of his "Justification is by Faith Alone" section of his *locus*, for instance, he writes:

Further, this also is to be noted, as we have already taught, that we do not say that faith through which we are justified is in our minds without good works, though we do say that the same "only" is that which takes hold of justification and the remission of sins. The eye cannot be without a head, brains, heart, liver, and other parts of the body, and yet the eye alone apprehends color and light. Therefore, those who reason against us in this way commit the error of false argument: faith (as they say) justifies; but faith is not alone; ergo faith alone does not justify.⁹²¹

Furthermore, Vermigli, like Calvin, affirms that the virtuous life (or good works) of the one who is justified in Christ is acceptable to God. He writes, "We have never denied that the works of those now justified are acceptable to God."⁹²² Nevertheless, for Peter Martyr, *sola*

⁹¹⁷ Ibid., 63 [112].

⁹¹⁸ Ibid. Newman explains his understanding of imputation at some length in pages 67-78 [72-83].

⁹¹⁹ Thomas L. Sheridan, *Newman on Justification: A Theological Biography* (New York: Alba House, 1967), 26-29, 265.

⁹²⁰ Newman, *Jfc.*, 291-293 [331-333].

⁹²¹ Vermigli, *Romanos*, 1312 [218]

⁹²² Ibid., 1227-1228 [134]. Cf. *Institutes*, 3:17:5, 10.

fide is not the problem; it is the solution, so long as it is rightly understood. Therefore, he goes to great lengths to argue that faith may be alone, but it must never *remain* alone.⁹²³

In their mutual concern to avoid “cheap grace” Newman and Vermigli stand together in the conviction that the one who is justified will most certainly live a life that bears witness to the holiness of God.

D. HOLD FORENSIC AND ACTUAL RIGHTEOUSNESS CLOSE TOGETHER

Following from the previous point, Newman and Vermigli are also concerned to include the production of actual righteousness in their doctrines of justification. For Newman, operating from the conviction that Jesus’ incarnation accomplished more than merely delivering sinners from guilt, emphasized the sinner’s fellowship and communion with the Divine,⁹²⁴ a relationship that gave way to a tangible form of righteousness, or “actual righteousness.”⁹²⁵

Similarly, Vermigli insists on the connection between forensic and actual righteousness in his doctrine of justification. Before describing God’s activity of forensic imputation in his *Romans locus*, he writes the following:

It is important to understand that when such an act [of justification] comes from God it is accomplished in two ways. Sometime, in reality, he brings forth righteousness in men. First, he endows them with his own Spirit and renews them fully by restoring the strength of their minds and by retrieving their human faculties from the greater part of their natural corruption; this idea is first a righteousness (*iustitia*) that is within and clings to our minds by the goodness of God through Christ. Second, when he has fashioned and renewed them in this way he gives right and holy works, and by their frequent and continuing use there is born in our minds a quality or (as they call it) a “habit” by which we are inclined to right and holy living. We do not deny that this type of righteousness is renewed in the hearts of the regenerate.⁹²⁶

⁹²³ Ibid., 1307 [212]. Quoting Jerome, Vermigli writes: “‘If love is absent, faith also departs with it.’ These words clearly declare that his judgment was that true faith cannot be divided from love, something we also teach and defend, but Pighius and his colleagues scorn it and cry out against it. Yet let him growl as much as he will; it is enough for us that this doctrine agrees with both the Scriptures and the fathers.”

⁹²⁴ Newman, *Jfc.*, 182-188 [211-218].

⁹²⁵ Ibid., 36 [38].

⁹²⁶ Vermigli, *Romanos*, 1182 [87].

To a greater extent than Vermigli, Newman's doctrine of justification consistently highlights God's work of sanctification: "The Voice of the Lord is mighty in *operation*. . . ."⁹²⁷

Concerning the content of this activity, Newman writes, "Imputed righteousness is the coming in of actual righteousness."⁹²⁸ On account of the dynamic presence of God's Spirit, such a work transcends the legal domain to include the moral renovation of one's soul, that is, sanctification.⁹²⁹ Newman regards the separation of sanctification from justification, which, in his view, was so often argued by the evangelical party of the Church of England, as "technical and unscriptural."⁹³⁰ This "unreal righteousness," says Newman, is an aberration.⁹³¹

Peter Martyr is also committed to holding forensic and actual righteousness together. Accordingly, Martyr upholds regeneration and sanctification as constituent elements of justification. For example, in his *1 Corinthians locus On Justification*, Martyr draws this connection:

A different kind of justification follows this upright life of holiness by which we are clearly praised, approved or declared just. For although good works do not bring that first righteousness which is given freely, yet they point to it and show it is present....⁹³²

The upright life of holiness, according to Martyr, is buttressed by the imputation of Christ's righteousness, which restores what is lacking in our "weak and mutilated" works.⁹³³ Even though these works ultimately fail to prevail with God, one's life of holiness nevertheless belongs to the doctrine of justification. Why? A Christian life of holiness serves to vindicate one's forensic justification, providing material proof that one is indeed regenerate. It is also

⁹²⁷ Newman, *Jfc.*, 79-80 [86].

⁹²⁸ *Ibid.*, 80 [86].

⁹²⁹ *Ibid.*, 80-81 [86-87].

⁹³⁰ *Ibid.*, 41 [44].

⁹³¹ *Ibid.*, 57 [61].

⁹³² Vermigli, *PMR*, 147. cf. *Romanos*, 1182 [87-88]; *Mosis Commentarii*, 59.

"Ad hanc rectam vitam sanctorum, consequitur quaedam alia species iustificationis, qua scilicet laudamur, approbamus, & iusti praedicamur. Nam bona opera licet illam primam iustitiam quae gratis conceditur non afferant, attamen indicant, & illam adesse demonstrant...." Vermigli, *Corinthios Commentarii*, 19.

⁹³³ *PMR*, 147.

accepted as pleasing to God and rewarded on the last day.⁹³⁴ Vermigli questions whether one can actually realize eternal salvation without such a living faith.⁹³⁵

With respect to the relationship of forensic and actual righteousness, Newman and Vermigli insist that both of them deserve a place in the doctrine of justification.

E. DISTINGUISH FORENSIC AND ACTUAL RIGHTEOUSNESS

While holding forensic imputation and sanctification together, Newman and Vermigli also insist on a proper distinction. Newman, for instance, is careful to distinguish “‘Christ,’ our propitiation, ‘within us’” from one’s actual righteousness.⁹³⁶ While affirming that justification effectively “renews” one’s soul,⁹³⁷ Newman is emphatic that such renewal is *not* derived from an infusion of inherent righteousness or the cultivation of *habitus*.⁹³⁸ Rather, it comes from an “adherent” righteousness, “depending wholly and absolutely on the Divine Indwelling.”⁹³⁹ Simply put, Newman’s doctrine recognizes in this indwelling a clear distinction between God’s forensic declaration and the cultivation of virtue, that is, “actual righteousness.” While unified in a single act, the two are regarded as notionally distinct.⁹⁴⁰

For Vermigli, “justification,” in a strict sense, is limited to a forensic activity; yet he also understands regeneration and sanctification as necessarily accompanying forensic imputation. At the outset of his *Romans locus* he raises an important question that lays groundwork for his distinction between forensic and actual righteousness: “Are men justified by works or by faith?”⁹⁴¹ He answers his question by asserting that “there are two meaning of ‘to justify,’ namely, in fact or in judgment or estimation.”⁹⁴² When identifying which of these two

⁹³⁴ Vermigli, *Romans* 1288 [195], 1291 [196].

⁹³⁵ *Ibid.*, 1318 [224]: “alioquin ad aeternam salutem non perventuros?” Martyr follows this directly with the qualifier that such virtue is the “fruit” of faith and not the cause of justification. “Atqui fructus isti sunt fidei, & iustificationis effecta, non causae.”

⁹³⁶ Newman, *Jfc.*, 200 [231]. When Newman describes this righteousness—that which is associated with the believer’s obedience—he calls it “actual,” (351 [397]).

⁹³⁷ *Ibid.*, 86 [93].

⁹³⁸ *Ibid.*, 348-352 [394-398].

⁹³⁹ *Ibid.*, 187 [218].

⁹⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, 67 [71-72].

⁹⁴¹ *Ibid.*, 1181 [87]: “Iustificentur ne homines operibus, ab fide.”

⁹⁴² *Ibid.*, 1182 [88].

options is more fundamental, he writes: “[W]hen debating the matter, Paul was influenced by the testimony of the history of Abraham in Genesis and by the authority of David; he used the verb ‘to be reckoned,’ and, with proper understanding, reasons in light of our present concern and question.”⁹⁴³ Thus, Vermigli chooses imputation over spiritual renewal as the proper ground of justification.

Newman and Vermigli, while seeking to hold forensic and actual righteousness together, insist on their proper distinction.

Common Commitments

A. AN AUGUSTINIAN HARMATOLOGY

Newman and Vermigli both resonate with Augustine’s doctrine of sin. Following the Bishop of Hippo, Newman underscores the initiative of divine grace, which is altogether necessary for salvation on account of our bondage to sin.⁹⁴⁴ To deny the reality of sin, or to rely upon one’s own righteousness, from Newman’s point of view, is the sin of pride, a vice that he routinely opposed in the Liberalism of his day.⁹⁴⁵ For Newman, God’s legal pronouncement is “a real and gracious act on God’s part towards us sinners,” precisely because sinners are otherwise without hope.⁹⁴⁶

Peter Martyr shares Newman’s belief in the anthropological necessity of divinely initiated grace. On this point, Martyr refers to the transgression of Adam in *Romans* 5 where one observes “the cause of so great an evil.”⁹⁴⁷ Following from the first man’s disobedience, humanity is “lost and condemned,” which includes infants.⁹⁴⁸ Later in his *Romans locus*, Vermigli asserts this point rather explicitly, “The works of unregenerate men are sins.”⁹⁴⁹ In

⁹⁴³ Ibid.

⁹⁴⁴ Jan Hendrik Walgrave, *Newman the Theologian: the Nature of Belief and Doctrine as Exemplified in His Life and Works*, trans. A. V. Little Dale (London: G. Chapman, 1960), 42-44. Newman explains how divine grace overcomes the unrighteousness of original sin in *Jfc.*, 88-91 [95-96].

⁹⁴⁵ Louis Bouyer, *Newman: His Life and Spirituality* (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 2011), 19.

⁹⁴⁶ Newman, *Jfc.*, 72 [77].

⁹⁴⁷ Vermigli, *Romanos*, 1196 [101]: “Accedit adhaec, quòd tanti mali causa exprimitur.”

⁹⁴⁸ Ibid., 1196 [102]: “iam inde à prima ipsa origine per primum hominem perditum sumus & damnati.”

⁹⁴⁹ Ibid., 1301 [201]: “. . . opera hominum non renatorum esse peccata.”

other words, such people are incapable of producing works that are acceptable to God. Therefore, the basis of justification cannot possibly rest on human ability. This sober awareness of sin is what Frank James has labeled Vermigli's "intensive Augustinianism."⁹⁵⁰

Martyr vehemently opposes the notion that God extends a general grace to all people in such a way that it enables them to exercise justifying faith. He labels such a view "Pelagianism" and considers it to be an affront to Scripture.⁹⁵¹ According to Vermigli, if redemptive grace is obtainable prior to the initial work of the Spirit which enlivens the soul, the justification that follows would be based upon human effort.⁹⁵² "They [his Roman Catholic interlocutors] hold that there is a kind of general grace accessible to all and common even to the unregenerate, who are in a sense helped to merit justification and do works which please God. But in saying this, they fall into the heresy of Pelagius."⁹⁵³

While the problem of human sin factors more significantly into Vermigli's overall doctrine of justification, Newman may be credited with the rhetorical edge when he writes:

I observe, then, we become inwardly just or righteous in God's sight, upon our regeneration, in the same essence in which we are utterly reprobate and abominable by nature, or (to use the strong language of the Homilies) as we are since Adam's fall "corrupt and naught," "without any spark of goodness in us," "without any virtuous or godly motion," "the image of the devil," "firebrands of hell and bondslaves of the devil," "having in ourselves no one part of our former purity and cleanness;" but being "altogether spotted and defiled," and "nothing else but a lump of sin."⁹⁵⁴

Newman and Vermigli maintain a sober and severe estimation of sin which recognizes the paucity of human righteousness in the unregenerate. Together they insist on the necessity

⁹⁵⁰ Frank A. James, III, "The Complex of Justification: Peter Martyr Vermigli Versus Albert Pighius," in *Peter Martyr Vermigli: Humanism, Republicanism, Reformation*, ed. Emidio Campi, Frank A. James, III, and Peter Opitz (Geneva: Librairie Droz, 2002), 52-53.

⁹⁵¹ Vermigli, *Romanos*, 1218-19 [125].

⁹⁵² Pressed through the framework of his intensive Augustinianism, Vermigli can't begin to countenance the idea that meritorious works of the unregenerate are somehow pleasing to God. Ibid., 1195 [101], 1199 [105], 1214-15 [121-122], 1235-36 [142-143], 1260-61 [168], 1288 [194], 1313-14 [219-220].

⁹⁵³ Ibid., 1216 [123]: "Est enim, inquiunt, gratia quaedam generalis omnibus exposita, & communis etiam hominibus non regeneratis, qua utcunque adiuti, possint mereri iustificationem, & facere opera, quae placeant Deo. Sed hoc quum dicunt, incidunt in haeresim Pelagii."

⁹⁵⁴ Newman, *Jfc.*, 89 [96].

of God's enlivening grace, "regeneration" in Newman's terms, which leads sinners to exercise justifying faith.

B. UNION WITH CHRIST

Newman's doctrine of Divine Presence, with its emphasis on participation in the life of God, may also be described in terms of union with Christ.⁹⁵⁵ In Newman's words:

Christ, in rising, raises His saints with Him to the right hand of power. They become instinct with His life, of one body with His flesh, divine sons, immortal kings, gods. He is in them, because He is in human nature; and He communicates to them that nature deified by becoming His, that them It may deify.⁹⁵⁶

We have noted how the concept of union with Christ comes to flower in Lecture VII where Newman develops the subject more fully, describing how "justification is the setting up of the Cross within us."⁹⁵⁷ This chapter, titled "The Characteristics of the Gift of Righteousness," explores the sanctifying capacity of justification in terms of the adherent presence of Christ in the human soul. But simply saying this much invites an additional question:

Again: if it be laid down that our justification consists in union with Christ, or reconciliation with God, this is an intelligible and fair answer; and then the question will arise, what is *meant* by union with Christ?⁹⁵⁸

For Newman, this Christological union comes to one's soul by the Holy Spirit, who properly imputes the righteousness of Christ by means of divine indwelling. Of the three Divine Persons, the Holy Spirit is identified as the proper agent of justification as a matter of his particular role in the economy of salvation, although not to the exclusion of the other Persons.⁹⁵⁹ Newman asserts, "This is really and truly our justification, not faith, not holiness, not (much less) a mere imputation; but through God's mercy, the very Presence of Christ."⁹⁶⁰

⁹⁵⁵ Charles Stephen Dessain, "Cardinal Newman and the Eastern Tradition," *Downside Review* 94 (1976): 95.

⁹⁵⁶ John Henry Newman, *An Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine* (New York: Doubleday, 1960), 140.

⁹⁵⁷ Newman, *Jfc.*, 173 [200].

⁹⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, 134 [148].

⁹⁵⁹ John Henry Newman, *PPS*, xi, 10, 1270. These sermons were published between 1834-1843.

⁹⁶⁰ Newman, *Jfc.*, 150 [167].

Newman's doctrine bears a remarkable similarity to Vermigli at this point. In view of his Augustinian conviction that humanity is a *massa perditionis*,⁹⁶¹ Vermigli asserts: "Unless [one's heart] has been renewed by the Spirit," there can be no justifying faith.⁹⁶² Vermigli envisages this faith to grow out of the Spirit's initial work, resulting in Christological union.⁹⁶³ He writes, "But now, delivered by the grace of God, we are joined with Christ by the Spirit, to Christ himself being raised from the dead. By this union we may bring forth fruit to God, and no more death and damnation."⁹⁶⁴ While Vermigli hardly uses the explicit terminology of "union with Christ," the notion that one is accepted by God on account of being "joined with Christ by the Spirit" is posited as the necessary bond that liberates one from death and enables him to "bring forth fruit to God."⁹⁶⁵

Union with Christ is for Newman and Vermigli the state in which one realizes spiritual deliverance from judgment and the fructifying work of the Spirit.⁹⁶⁶

C. NEED FOR FORENSIC IMPUTATION

Newman and Vermigli are equally committed to upholding the doctrine of imputation. Newman, for example, stresses the forensic nature of justification by distinguishing the declaration from the gift that it declares. As noted, he regards them as notionally distinct even though they are unified in a single act:

Justification is the "glorious Voice of the Lord" declaring us to be righteous. That it is a declaration not a making, is sufficiently clear from this one argument that it is the justification of a *sinner*, of one who *has been* a sinner; and the past cannot be reversed except by *accounting* it reversed.⁹⁶⁷

⁹⁶¹ Vermigli, *Romanos*, 1196 [102].

⁹⁶² Ibid., 1249 [157]: "Sed animus humanus nisi innovetur spiritu."

⁹⁶³ Similar to John Calvin, *Institutes*, 3.16.1.

⁹⁶⁴ Vermigli, *Romanos*, 1196-1197 [102]: "Sed iam nunc liberati Dei gratia, Christo per spiritum copulamur, Christo, inquam, excitato a mortuis, ex qua coniunctione iam Deo fructificabimus non amplius morti et damnationi."

⁹⁶⁵ Ibid., 1196-1197 [102-103].

⁹⁶⁶ Joseph McLelland argues that union with Christ is a key to understanding Vermigli's doctrine of justification, even though the language is not made explicit in the *Romans locus*. *Visible Words*, 113, 142.

⁹⁶⁷ Newman, *Jfc.*, 67 [71-72].

Newman emphasizes the need for an “*imputing* righteousness,”⁹⁶⁸ an “estimation of righteousness [in Christ] vouchsafed to the past, and extending from the past to the present as far as the present is affected by the past.”⁹⁶⁹ Since the problem of human guilt is of such depth and is exhibited before the judgment seat of God, a *judicial* action is therefore required.⁹⁷⁰ Because this imputation consists in the Divine Presence, its basis is on one hand understood to be distinct from one’s soul while at the same time it is considered to exist *in nobis*.⁹⁷¹

Vermigli likewise recognizes the catastrophic problem of guilt, bequeathed to humanity from Adam, and the need for imputation to effectively deal with the legal dimensions of the problem. In this sense, Peter Martyr basically agrees with Newman by defining imputation as a judicial transference of righteousness to the sinner.⁹⁷² The difference between their views comes down to the location of imputation’s formal cause. For Vermigli, it is not in the Divine Presence but rather in the righteousness of Christ which God reckons to the sinner so that one is considered to be righteous *coram deo*.⁹⁷³ We shall examine this difference more thoroughly later; for now, we wish to analyze the basic similarities of their doctrine of forensic imputation.

Like Newman, Vermigli is careful to stress that the crediting of Christ’s righteousness only happens by divine initiative. Commenting on *Romans* 4: 1-4, Martyr explains how the concept of “imputation” is based entirely on grace: “[Paul postulates imputation] as an antithesis to merit or debt, so that he to whom something is imputed neither deserves it nor receives it as debt.”⁹⁷⁴ Furthermore, this imputation is two-fold in that the sinner receives a

⁹⁶⁸ Ibid., 67 [72].

⁹⁶⁹ Ibid., 68 [72-73].

⁹⁷⁰ Ibid., 72 [76-77].

⁹⁷¹ Ibid., 187 [217]. Newman does not use the phrase *extra nos* to describe the external dimension of imputation. In keeping with his doctrine of God’s adherent presence, he prefers to emphasize its interiority (cf. Ibid., 187 [218]).

⁹⁷² Vermigli, *Romanos*, 1182 [87]: “Interdum vero iustificat Deus absolvendo a peccatis, adscribendo et imputando iustitiam.”

⁹⁷³ Ibid., 1201 [107], 1314 [220].

⁹⁷⁴ Ibid., 1194 [100]: “. . .nos ex operibus non iustificari. Quoque id magis persuaderet, verbum id logizein, quod dicimus imputare, adscribere alicui iustitiam, aut pro iusto aliquem habere urget, et vult habere antithesim ad meritum et debitum, ita ut is cui quippiam imputatur, id non mereatur, neque ut debitum accipiat.”

forensic crediting of Christ's righteousness and also the non-imputation of his own sins.⁹⁷⁵ On this level, Vermigli and Newman are essentially of one mind.⁹⁷⁶

For Vermigli, imputation is also *extra nos* in that it addresses one's legal status, and not a form of *iustitia in nobis*, which affects the soul. Contrary to medieval Roman Catholic theology, Martyr asserts that justifying righteousness, "does not adhere [*inhaere*] to our souls, but is imputed by God."⁹⁷⁷ As noted, Martyr also articulates a reverse imputation in which the sinner's guilt is put upon Christ.⁹⁷⁸ This much is consonant with Newman who likewise understands imputation in terms of one's legal status before God apart from an inherent form of righteousness. Furthermore, Newman and Vermigli also agree on the result of imputation, that it entails the absolution of sin⁹⁷⁹ and the reception of divine favor.⁹⁸⁰ Vermigli writes: "Moreover, as to the remission of sins, a blessing promised to us, we should remember that the chief and principal point consists in this, that we are received into favor by God and our sins forgiven us."⁹⁸¹ With such favor, reconciliation is established between the defendant and the judge, bringing one into a position of righteousness *coram deo*.

Agreement between Newman and Vermigli on the need for forensic imputation grows from the realization that the problem of human guilt is of such profound depth and of a particularly legal nature. Therefore, God provides forgiveness and favor through a forensic transference of his own righteousness.

D. THE GIFT OF THE HOLY SPIRIT AND MANIFESTATION OF "WORKS"

Newman and Vermigli both maintain a robust pneumatology. For Newman, the Holy Spirit is the Gift *and* the Agent who applies the benefits of Christ's death and resurrection. Starting

⁹⁷⁵ Ibid., 1252 [159].

⁹⁷⁶ The one significant point of discontinuity is Newman's contention that actual righteousness accrues merit *coram deo*. Newman, *Jfc.*, 151-152 [168-169].

⁹⁷⁷ Ibid., 1194 [100]: "Quibus ex verbis non solum ellicimus iustitiam, qua dicimur iustificari, non inhaere animis nostris, sed imputari a Deo..."

⁹⁷⁸ Ibid., 1264 [172].

⁹⁷⁹ Ibid., 1182 [87]: "Deus absolvendo à peccatis."

⁹⁸⁰ Ibid., 1217 [123].

⁹⁸¹ Ibid., 1274 [182]: "Quod autem attinet ad remissionem peccatorum, quum nobis promissa sit benedictio, cogitare debemus, caput, & principium eius esse, ut recipiamur à Deo in gratiam, utque nobis peccata condonentur."

with an initial grace that enlivens the sinner's soul,⁹⁸² this work includes pardon, grace, reconciliation, renewal, holiness, and spiritual communion—a collection of benefits that Newman summarizes with the word “Atonement.”⁹⁸³ According to Newman, this is the manner in which the presence of Christ comes to bear upon one who is justified: by the Spirit. The Son merits salvation and the Holy Spirit applies it through personal inhabitation.

Similarly, Vermigli begins his *locus* by explaining how God endows believers “with his own Spirit and renews them fully by restoring the strength of their minds. . . .”⁹⁸⁴ As with Newman, a concern for the Spirit's renewing work is basic to Vermigli's doctrine, as demonstrated by his description of justification as “the summit of all *piety*.”⁹⁸⁵ Such piety begins with the enlivening presence of the Spirit, which in turn produces faith, resulting in justification.⁹⁸⁶

When Newman describes the source of the Christian's piety, he often employs the biblical image of *shekinah* to describe the tangible work of the Spirit.⁹⁸⁷ For Newman, this glory denotes an “attribute, property, virtue, or presence of the Divine Nature manifested visibly.”⁹⁸⁸ He cites the words of Jesus in which the Lord prayed to the Father, “The glory which Thou gavest Me, *I have given them*.”⁹⁸⁹ Newman then asks, “What is this glory which has passed from Christ to us?”⁹⁹⁰ He answers by pointing to the *glory* of the Father which raised Jesus from the dead, a glory that Paul attributes to “the Spirit of holiness.”⁹⁹¹

⁹⁸² Jfc., 80-81 [86-87].

⁹⁸³ Ibid., 202-203 [233-235].

⁹⁸⁴ Vermigli, *Romanos*, 1182 [87].

⁹⁸⁵ Emphasis Added. Ibid., 1191 [96]. “columen totius pietatis.” Calvin uses similar language to describe justification: “*quae pietatis est totius summa*” in Calvin, *Institutes* 3:15:7. Petrus Barth & Guilelmus Niesel (eds.) *Johannis Calvini Opera Selecta* 4:245 (Munich: Chr. Kaiser, 1958: Second Edition).

⁹⁸⁶ Ibid., 1282 [190].

⁹⁸⁷ Newman, *Jfc*, 156 [177-178].

⁹⁸⁸ Ibid., 162-163 [186].

⁹⁸⁹ Ibid., 163 [187].

⁹⁹⁰ Ibid.

⁹⁹¹ Ibid.

Vermigli is also concerned with how justification leads to the development of tangible faith,⁹⁹² and with Newman he looks to the Spirit for the answer. Martyr posits “two inward movements” of the Holy Spirit in which God exerts influence upon one’s mind and volition.⁹⁹³ From this double movement, faith is “engendered.”⁹⁹⁴ Vermigli conveys this idea—that God forgives those whom he has already enlivened—in his exposition of Romans 8:1-2 where he states that “after the Spirit has first moved the hearts of the hearers to believe, then at last the Gospel obtains its power to save.”⁹⁹⁵ For this reason, Martyr describes the Holy Spirit as the “cause” of faith.⁹⁹⁶

The presence of the Spirit produces virtuous “works” in and through a believer. For Newman, these works are generated by the adherent presence of God. Such works are meritorious, rooted in the merit achieved by Christ, and are essential for salvation: “That we are absolutely saved by obedience, that is, by *what we are*, has introduced the proper merit of good works; that we are absolutely saved by faith, or by *what Christ is*, the notion that good works are not conditions of our salvation.”⁹⁹⁷ In a footnote to this statement, added in Newman’s *Third Edition*, he writes the following:

Catholics hold that our good works, as proceeding from the grace of the Holy Ghost, cannot be worthless, but have a real and proper value; on the other hand, that the great reward of eternal life is due to them only in consequence of the promise of God. Good works have on this ground a claim on God’s faithfulness to His promises, and there a claim on His justice, for it would be unjust to promise and not fulfill.⁹⁹⁸

Newman’s *via media* is sufficiently elastic to accommodate the Catholic emphasis on the meritorious character of good works. Because, in Newman’s view, Christians possess twofold righteousness (forensically imputed and also inchoate, that is, the incipient form of righteousness that resides in the believer) it is natural for him to maintain that the former

⁹⁹² Vermigli, *Romanos*, 1182 [87], 1215-16 [122].

⁹⁹³ Ibid., 1249-50 [156-157].

⁹⁹⁴ Ibid., 1284 [191].

⁹⁹⁵ Ibid., 609: “At postquam spiritus corda audientium semel permoverit, ut credant, tum demum Evangelium vim suam ad servandum obtinet.”

⁹⁹⁶ Ibid., 1284 [191]: “quoniam causa est fidei” Peter Martyr also asserts: “as soon as one believes, he is immediately justified.” 1305 [210]: “Quam primum inquit homo credit, confestim, inquit iustificatus est.”

⁹⁹⁷ Newman, *Jfc.*, 2 [2].

⁹⁹⁸ Ibid.

consists of Christ's merits while the latter involves merit that belongs to the Christian. This *et... et* approach allows him to say that "the inherent righteousness of a true Christian, viewed as distinct from Christ's inward presence, is something real."⁹⁹⁹ Part and parcel of this real righteousness is the Christian's real works which accrue real merit before God. Such meritorious works can increase as one's apprehension of justification itself increases (by a greater manifestation of the Spirit).¹⁰⁰⁰ Simply put, since justification and sanctification are united in Newman's doctrine and grow together in proportion to God's manifest presence, the believer's meritorious works likewise grow.¹⁰⁰¹

Vermigli is absolutely emphatic that works can in no way merit justification.¹⁰⁰² However, because he includes regeneration and sanctification in the broader confines of justification, the production of (non-meritorious) works are a necessary component of justification. This broader view of justification, what Martyr calls "a different kind of justification," anticipates the final judgment when men and women are finally justified.¹⁰⁰³ We have noted that in this sense Vermigli can be said to maintain *duplex iustificatio*,¹⁰⁰⁴ not that he understands justification to have a double formal cause (what McGrath suggests is the standard form of *duplex iustificatio*) as was true during the Tridentine proceedings.¹⁰⁰⁵ If there is one thing that Martyr's *locus* makes clear it is, once again, that "works" in no way cause justification ("... in reality good works are effects of righteousness, and not causes").¹⁰⁰⁶ Therefore, justification is never "by" works when we talk about the formal cause. Similarly to his colleague, Martin Bucer, Vermigli understands God to accept¹⁰⁰⁷ and reward¹⁰⁰⁸ works as a

⁹⁹⁹ Ibid. 199-200 [230]. Newman usually describes this inherent righteousness in terms of "actual righteousness" in order to support his doctrine of uncreated grace and avoid the notion of *habitus* (80).

¹⁰⁰⁰ Ibid., 151-152 [168-169].

¹⁰⁰¹ Ibid.

¹⁰⁰² "Therefore, we must take away all merit, not only in those who are not yet justified, but also in those who have been justified." Vermigli, *Romanos*, 1288 [195].

¹⁰⁰³ Vermigli, *Corinthios Commentarii*, 19 [147]. Cf. *Romanos*, 1182 [88].

¹⁰⁰⁴ Ibid.

¹⁰⁰⁵ Alister E. McGrath, *ID*, 313.

¹⁰⁰⁶ Vermigli, *Romanos*, 1228, [135].

¹⁰⁰⁷ Ibid., 1227-1228 [134]; cf. *Corinthios Commentarii*, 19 [147].

¹⁰⁰⁸ Ibid., 1288 [195].

necessary constituent of final justification. Their works are central to sanctification,¹⁰⁰⁹ which for Vermigli belongs to the doctrine of justification.

On the basis of the above considerations, we conclude the following. The production of good works by the regenerate indicates that they have received the imputation of Christ's righteousness.¹⁰¹⁰ The difficult question is whether we can say that Martyr teaches justification *by* works. Concerning the formal cause, the answer is a resounding no. The warp and woof of Martyr's *locus* is dedicated to arguing against justification by works in that sense. But when we broaden the focus of our question beyond the formal cause to consider the place of works in the future judgment, when God justifies someone "in fact" and not simply in "estimation," accepting and rewarding such works because they are performed in Christ, the answer appears to be yes. In this way, Vermigli affirms justification *by* works.

Partly because of their Augustinian understanding of sin, and partly because of their concern to emphasize the need for Christian virtue, Newman and Vermigli share a pneumatological emphasis in their doctrines of justification in which the agency of the Spirit transforms the sinner's mind and volition with a view to manifesting good works. Such works validate the reality of one's initial justification. In this way, Newman and Vermigli both affirm justification *of* works. For Newman these works are meritorious since those who are justified develop through active obedience the incipient form of righteousness, which God gives to his children in his adherent presence. For Vermigli, works are never meritorious; they constitute the effect (or fruit) of forensic imputation, which is recognized as the proper cause (or root). But since the believer's works are buttressed by the righteousness of Christ, they are accepted and rewarded by God. Thus, in different ways, Newman and Vermigli also both affirm justification *by* works.

E. *Duplex iustitia*

One way to describe the doctrines of Newman and Vermigli on justification is in terms of a "two-fold righteousness," imputed *and* actual. This commitment grows out of their desire to

¹⁰⁰⁹ Martyr writes, "I answer that such [non-meritorious] works are profitable to the regenerate, for by living uprightly and orderly they are renewed and made perfect." Ibid., 1291 [196].

¹⁰¹⁰ Ibid., 1228-1229 [135]. "And Christ would want everyone to understand that none except the just are received into the kingdom of heaven. Therefore, he considers these external works so that it might be clearly understood by them that righteousness is imputed to men by faith."

ground justification in a forensic righteousness while also promoting the formation of actual faith. In Newman's words, it is the twin movements of "pardon and renovation."¹⁰¹¹ Such a position seeks to avoid a legal fiction which might drive a wedge between the two, thus bringing the Protestant categories of justification and sanctification into a closer relationship.

Thomas Holtzen is correct to point out that Newman's doctrine of justification is not a *duplex iustitia* if one strictly defines the position by two *equal* formal causes:

Despite the assertion of "two formal causes," Newman does not hold to a strict theory of a *duplex iustitia*; that is a theory of two equal formal causes of justification. Rather, when he speaks of "two formal causes" of justification he distinguishes what he calls a proper formal cause and an improper formal cause (or proper form or improper form).¹⁰¹²

While Newman does not posit two equal formal causes, he does include two distinct forms of righteousness in his overall doctrine of justification, a position that has an equally legitimate claim on the term *duplex iustitia*. Along this line, it is noteworthy that in his appendix Newman highlights how his position "very nearly resemble[s] Bucer's, among the Protestants, and that of Pighius, Mussus, and many others of the Roman School."¹⁰¹³ In this context, he likens the logic of his doctrine of justification, which insists upon both "holiness and works," with the position of these outstanding exemplars of the *duplex iustitia*.¹⁰¹⁴

When Newman speaks of "two formal causes," (one proper—the forensic imputation of Christ's righteousness—and the other improper—the actual righteousness *in* the Christian, though not "of" him, mediated by the indwelling of the Spirit) he insists that both are fundamental to justification.¹⁰¹⁵ Holding these actions together, Newman maintains that the improper (internal) is derived and dependent on the proper (external) form of righteousness. In this sense, Newman's position meaningfully resembles Vermigli's

¹⁰¹¹ Newman, *Jfc.*, 101 [112].

¹⁰¹² Thomas L. Holtzen, "Union with God and the Holy Spirit: A New Paradigm of Justification" (PhD diss., Marquette University, 2002), 181-182.

¹⁰¹³ Newman, *Jfc.*, 348 [394].

¹⁰¹⁴ "Mussus" is a reference to Cornelio Musso (1511-1574) Bishop of Bitonto, an outspoken advocate of double justice at the Six Session of the Council of Trent. Christopher J. Malloy, *Engrafted into Christ: A Critique of the Joint Declaration* 233 (New York: Lang, 2005), 71.

¹⁰¹⁵ Newman, *Jfc.*, xi, 361 [407], 367 [413], 381-382 [423-425].

doctrine. In fact, Newman almost says as much in his appendix where he once again compares his view to the *duplex iustitia* of Bucer and 16th Century *Evangelisme*:

Now it happens that this doctrine appears to have been held by Bucer as distinct from the other Reformers; it is also the doctrine of the Canons of Cologne in their Antididagma of 1544; it was held by Pighius, Seripando, and others, at the Council of Trent.... In this then I conceive to lie the unity of the Catholic doctrine on the subject of justification, that we are saved by Christ's imputed righteousness, and by our own inchoate righteousness at once.¹⁰¹⁶

As we have argued, Peter Martyr's doctrine of justification, even in its most mature form, remained fundamentally consistent with that of Bucer. And with regard to the basic contours of the *duplex iustitia*, we are arguing that it resembles Newman's. Take for instance the conclusion of Newman's statement quoted above, "[W]e are saved by Christ's imputed righteousness, and by our own inchoate righteousness at once." In a similar vein, Vermigli asserts, "But now, delivered [from our sin which results in condemnation] by the grace of God, we are joined with Christ by the Spirit, to Christ himself being raised from the dead. By this union we may bring forth fruit to God, and no more death and damnation."¹⁰¹⁷ Frank James provides a helpful summary of this position: "For Vermigli, the proper understanding of the nature of justification is that it includes both the act and its consequences; its cause and effects and indeed, eternal consequences. Justification is thus an event necessarily accompanied by a process."¹⁰¹⁸

Given their commitment to imputed *and* actual righteousness, and despite significant differences in how their doctrines hang together, Newman and Vermigli maintain positions on justification that are appropriately described as *duplex iustitia*.

¹⁰¹⁶ Ibid., 368 [414]. In this context, Newman also mentions the "Ratisbon Conference" as another example of the sort of *duplex iustitia* with which he is sympathetic (369 [415]).

¹⁰¹⁷ Vermigli, *Romanos*, 1196-1197 [102]: "Sed iam nunc liberati Dei gratia, Christo per spiritum copulamur, Christo, inquam, excitato a mortuis, ex qua coniunctione iam Deo fructificabimus non amplius morti et damnationi."

¹⁰¹⁸ Frank A. James, III, "*De Iustificatione*: The Evolution of Peter Martyr Vermigli's Doctrine of Justification" (PhD diss., Westminster Theological Seminary, 2000), 346.

Different Commitments

A. SACRAMENTAL FRAMEWORK OF JUSTIFICATION

For Newman, the sacraments have instrumental value. Accordingly, “Justification comes *through* the Sacraments; is received *by* faith; *consists* in God’s inward presence; and *lives* in obedience.”¹⁰¹⁹ Against the low-church evangelicals of his day, whom he understood to be denigrating the importance of the sacraments,¹⁰²⁰ Newman contends that sacramental rites actually inculcate Christian faith.¹⁰²¹

By contrast, Vermigli’s *locus* on justification contains scant attention to the role of the sacraments in mediating justifying grace. He first broaches the subject in proposition one of his *Romans Locus* where he confronts the position of his Roman Catholic opponents with regard to the role of ceremonies.¹⁰²² Martyr finds their position to be inconsistent with the New Testament for the way it ascribes “the forgiveness of sins and bestowing of grace to the sacraments, just as in the Old Testament they were attributed to circumcision.”¹⁰²³ Martyr asserts: “Indeed, we utterly deny that any sacraments bestow grace. They do offer grace, but it is by “signification.”¹⁰²⁴ For in sacraments and words, and in the visible signs, the promises of God made through Christ are set before us.”¹⁰²⁵

Operating with the above conviction, Vermigli repudiates the Roman Catholic doctrine of baptismal regeneration.¹⁰²⁶ He asserts that as Abraham was justified by faith before receiving the sign of circumcision the Christian experience of justification is antecedent to one’s experience of baptism.¹⁰²⁷ For Vermigli, the Sacrament of Baptism has no more power to justify

¹⁰¹⁹ Newman, *Jfc.*, 278 [318].

¹⁰²⁰ *Ibid.*, v.

¹⁰²¹ *Ibid.*, 280-282 [320-322].

¹⁰²² *Ibid.*, 1208-1209 [115-116].

¹⁰²³ *Ibid.*, 1212 [118-119].

¹⁰²⁴ Joseph C. McLelland, *The Visible Words of God: An Exposition of the Sacramental Theology of Peter Martyr Vermigli, A.D. 1500-1562* (Edinburgh: Oliver & Boyd, 1957), 130-135.

¹⁰²⁵ Vermigli, *Romanos*, 1212 [119]. Later in his *locus*, in proposition three, Martyr makes a similar point: “As to the sacraments, we have often taught how justification is to be attributed to them, for they stand in relation to justification as does the preaching of the Gospel and the promise of Christ offered to us for salvation,” 1318 [224].

¹⁰²⁶ *Ibid.*, 1251 [158].

¹⁰²⁷ *Ibid.*, 1251 [159]. See also 1315 [221].

than do the virtues of love and hope.¹⁰²⁸ To insist on the mediation of baptism for justification, according to Peter Martyr, is to teach a position of meritorious works. “So great is the opposition between grace and works,” Martyr concludes, “that Paul says, ‘If of grace then it is not now of works, and if of works, then it is not of grace.’”¹⁰²⁹

Important differences exist between Newman and Vermigli on the Sacraments, differences that are seemingly rooted in their respective backgrounds. In Newman’s case, his perception that Evangelicals of his day were denigrating the role of the Sacraments seemed to contradict his articulation of their centrality.¹⁰³⁰ For Vermigli, after forty two years as a Catholic priest, the notion of the Sacraments functioning as instruments of grace beyond “signification” (i.e., functioning as the efficacious means by which one is enlivened by the Spirit) was tantamount to works righteousness.¹⁰³¹

B. FAITH ALONE

In a certain sense, Newman and Vermigli both affirm *sola fide*.¹⁰³² In the first edition of his *Lectures*, Newman, writing as an Anglican, used the language of “faith only” as a “lively mode of speech [figurative] for saying that we are justified neither by faith nor by works, but by God only.” However, it is clear that Newman’s interpretation of *sola fide* differs vastly from Vermigli’s, which regards faith as the sole instrument. For Newman, faith is “the sole *internal* instrument, not the sole instrument of any kind.”¹⁰³³ Such a distinction is a critical component of Newman’s doctrine:

There would be nothing inconsistent, then, in Faith being the sole instrument of justification, and yet Baptism also the sole instrument, and that at the same time,

¹⁰²⁸ Ibid., 1315-1315 [221-222].

¹⁰²⁹ Ibid., 1316 [222].

¹⁰³⁰ As Newman put it in his Advertisement: “The present Volume originated in the following way: It was brought home to the writer from various quarters, that a prejudice existed in many serious minds against certain essential Christian truths, such as Baptismal Regeneration and the Apostolical Ministry, in consequence of a belief that they fostered notions of human merit, were dangerous to the inward life of religion, and incompatible with the doctrine of justifying faith....” Newman, *Jfc.*, v.

¹⁰³¹ Ibid., 1316 [222]. McLelland, *Visible Words of God*, 130-135.

¹⁰³² Newman, *Jfc.*, 244 [279]. Although in the *Third Edition* (1874) of his *Lectures*, the Catholic Newman retreated from faith alone in a brief footnote: “Catholics hold that, not faith only, but faith, hope, and charity, are the ‘sustaining causes of justification.’” Ibid., 255.

¹⁰³³ Ibid., 226 [259].

because in distinct senses; an inward instrument in no way interfering with an outward instrument. Baptism might be the hand of the giver, and Faith the hand of the receiver. However, this is not the exact relation of Faith to baptism, as is plain for this reason—that Baptism occurs but once, whereas justification is a state, and Faith “abides.” Justification, then, needs a perpetual instrument, such as faith can be, and Baptism cannot. Each, then, has its own office in the work of justification; Baptism at the time when it is administered, and faith ever after.¹⁰³⁴

In Newman’s vision, the means by which one grasps Christ includes more than faith; it also consists in baptism.¹⁰³⁵ Faith, Newman argues, represents a series of activities that include the sacraments, love, and obedience. He writes:

While then we reserve to Baptism our new birth, and to the Eucharist the ultimate springs of the new life, and to Love what may be called its plastic power, and to Obedience its being the atmosphere in which faith breathes, still the divinity appointed or (in other words) the mysterious virtue of Faith remains. It alone coalesces with the Sacraments, brings them into effect, dissolves (as it were) their outward case, and through them unites the soul to God.¹⁰³⁶

Newman and Vermigli both countenance Hebrews 11:1 in their definition of faith: “the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen.”¹⁰³⁷ For Newman, this “substance” of faith, because it is “unseen” is thought to remain undefined until it grasps its proper object, which, for the Christian, is the living Christ.¹⁰³⁸ With this exegesis, Newman understands the object of faith to be the presence of Christ.¹⁰³⁹ Thus, faith is not merely assent of the mind (*assensus*); nor is it simply trust (*fiducia*)—it is, for Newman, essentially union with Christ.¹⁰⁴⁰ As we have noted, the closest Newman comes to offering a positive definition of faith alone is in the following words: “Salvation by faith only is but another way of saying salvation by grace only.”¹⁰⁴¹

¹⁰³⁴ Ibid.

¹⁰³⁵ Newman explicitly rejects the notion, attributed to Luther, that faith is the “primary instrument” of justification. Ibid., 244 [279].

¹⁰³⁶ Ibid., 236-237 [271].

¹⁰³⁷ Ibid., 252 [288].

¹⁰³⁸ Ibid., 253-254 [289-290].

¹⁰³⁹ Ibid., 266-273 [304-313].

¹⁰⁴⁰ Ibid.

¹⁰⁴¹ Ibid., 283 [324].

Vermigli uses Hebrews 11 to insist that faith is the instrument by which one first appropriates justification, and, furthermore, continues to lay hold of it.¹⁰⁴² “But nothing else is meant by those words [of Hebrews 11] than that the things we hope for are strengthened and confirmed in our minds by faith.”¹⁰⁴³ In the context of expositing this passage Martyr offers a cogent definition of how he understands “faith”: “[F]aith is a firm and assured assent of the mind to the words of God, an assent inspired by the Holy Spirit to the salvation of believers.”¹⁰⁴⁴ Looking at the larger context of Martyr’s *Romans locus*, he moves from his first proposition, that justification is “not by works,” to proposition two that forgiveness is properly “received by faith.” Here he concentrates on Romans 4 where he stresses Paul’s statement, “To one who does not work but trusts him who justifies the ungodly, faith is reckoned to him as righteousness.”¹⁰⁴⁵ This one “takes hold and receives” the promise of forgiveness.¹⁰⁴⁶ It is “never alone but always draws along with it various motions of the mind,” particularly “confidence, hope, and similar affections.”¹⁰⁴⁷ The manifestation of such qualities verifies that one truly possesses justifying faith.¹⁰⁴⁸

Newman’s overall vision of Christian faith, with its emphasis on virtue, is not far from Vermigli’s concern to fortify post-conversion faith with qualities such as hope and affection. Again, in Vermigli’s words, “Christ requires more of us than faith, for who doubts that he wants those who are justified to live uprightly and to practice virtue of all kinds. . . .”¹⁰⁴⁹ Thus, one might say that for Peter Martyr the *nature* of faith is active and holy. But if we were to ask Vermigli about the *function* of faith with regard to justification, he would

¹⁰⁴² Vermigli, *Romanos*, 1253 [160], 1261 [169], 1283 [190], 1292 [198], 1321 [227].

¹⁰⁴³ *Ibid.*, 1278-1279 [186].

¹⁰⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, 1184 [90]. Martyr uses Hebrews 11 as a touchstone in his definition of faith from pages 1184 to 1187 [90 to 92].

¹⁰⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, 1254-55 [161-162]. Martyr also considers Ephesians, Philippians, Hebrews, 1 Peter, 1 John, the Gospels, Acts, and the Old Testament. *Ibid.*, 1258-1264 [165-172].

¹⁰⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, 1262 [170]: “apprehendimus promissiones Dei.”

¹⁰⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, 1183 [89].

¹⁰⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, 1183 [89].

¹⁰⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, 1318 [224].

instinctively answer with *sola fide*, arguing that one's good works have no role whatsoever in causing justification.¹⁰⁵⁰ In the clearest of terms he writes:

And when we say that one is justified by faith alone we obviously say nothing else than that one is justified only by the mercy of God and by the merit of Christ, which we cannot grasp by any other instrument than faith alone.¹⁰⁵¹

IV. Different Conclusions

A. FORMAL CAUSE

An interesting way to compare Newman and Vermigli with regard to the formal cause of justification is with reference to Andreas Osiander. It has been observed that John Henry Newman and Osiander share a similar conception of justification by divine indwelling; furthermore, Newman and Vermigli both comment on Osiander's position.¹⁰⁵² Richard Laurence, Archbishop of Cashel, for instance, pointed out in 1839 that Newman assigned "a particular sense to the word Justification which with exception of Osiander no Protestant ever affixed before him."¹⁰⁵³ Newman himself also intimates this connection in the appendix of his *Lectures*¹⁰⁵⁴ where he says that Osiander's doctrine concerning the essential

¹⁰⁵⁰ Ibid.

¹⁰⁵¹ Ibid., 1321 [227]: "Cumque dicimus, hominem iustificari sola fide, nihil sane aliud dicimus, quam hominem iustificari sola Dei misericordia, et solius Christi merito: quae non alio instrumento apprehendere possumus, quam sola fide."

¹⁰⁵² After Andreas Osiander (1498-1552) moved from Nuremburg to the University of Königsberg as professor of theology, he published his controversial book, *De Iustificatione* (1550), in which he proposed an alternative Lutheran view of justification. Andreas D. A. Osiander, "Eine Disputation von der Rechtfertigung" in *Gesamtausgabe*, ed. Gerhard Müller and Gottfried Seebaß, vol. 9 (Gütersloh: Gütersloher, 1994), 427-447. For more on the Osiandrian controversy, see Todd Billings, *Calvin, Participation, and the Gift: The Activity of Believers in Union with Christ, Changing Paradigms in Historical Theology* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2007), 53-63; Reinhold Seeberg, *Textbook of the History of Doctrines* trans. Charles E Hay, vol. 2, *History of Doctrines in the Ancient Church* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1958), 369-374; Mark A Garcia, *Life in Christ: Union with Christ and Twofold Grace in Calvin's Theology*, *Studies in Christian History and Thought* (Milton Keynes: Paternoster, 2008), 43-45, 197-199, 201-218, 239-252. David C. Steinmetz, *Reformers in the Wings* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1971), 91-99; cf. Alister McGrath, *ID*, 241-243.

¹⁰⁵³ Peter Toon, *Evangelical Theology, 1833-1856: A Response to Tractarianism* (London: Marshall, Morgan and Scott, 1979), 155.

¹⁰⁵⁴ Jfc. 387-389 [426-428]. Newman admits that he was unable to obtain Osiander's writings first hand: "His *Confessio de Iustificatione* was published in Latin and German, but neither it nor any of his other works have fallen in my way" (387 [426-427]).

righteousness of Christ is “not very different from the doctrine of Petavius.”¹⁰⁵⁵ Therefore, consideration of Osiander’s formulation offers insight into the way that Vermigli may have assessed Newman’s doctrine.

Osiander held that the essential righteousness of Christ’s divine nature (apart from his human nature) was the sole cause of justification. The deity of Christ justifies because it alone is essentially righteous.¹⁰⁵⁶ Such righteousness, according to Osiander, is not forensically attributed to the sinner in an alien righteousness (*iustitia aliena*); rather it consists in the substantial indwelling of Christ’s righteousness (*iustitia Dei inhabitans*). In other words, according to Osiander’s hypothesis, justification is not recognized to be the forgiveness of sins; rather, it consists in this essential indwelling which renews one’s soul.¹⁰⁵⁷ In Osiander’s words: “Therefore, we are justified with his essential righteousness, as it is written, ‘One will call him YHWH, who is our righteousness.’”¹⁰⁵⁸ Simply put, justifying righteousness is located in Christ who abides in the believer.¹⁰⁵⁹

It is interesting to consider the central motivation behind Osiander’s position,¹⁰⁶⁰ which he conveys in his *De Justificatione* when he reacts to the forensic emphasis of

¹⁰⁵⁵ Ibid., 388 [427].

¹⁰⁵⁶ This is a fundamental difference from Osiander to Newman who makes no such distinction between the natures of Christ’s indwelling presence.

¹⁰⁵⁷ Seeberg, *Textbook of the History of Doctrines* 370.

¹⁰⁵⁸ Osiander, “Eine Disputation von der Rechtfertigung,” 439. “Daher sein wir mit seiner wesentlichen gerechtigkeit gerecht, wie geschriben ist: >>Man wirt in nennen HERR der unser gerechtigkeit ist<<.”

¹⁰⁵⁹ David Steinmetz summarizes the basic logic of Osiander’s hypothesis, “As the flesh of Jesus was the bearer of the Logos, so now the spoken word of the preacher is the bearer of the divine word which is received by faith alone. When the word is grasped by faith, it indwells man and unites with him. Where the word is present it transforms man and renews him in the image of God. Man is justified not because his works are now holy, but because Christ indwells him. The indwelling Christ is the basis of man’s acceptance, and not the renewal as such, though where Christ is present man is renewed in the image of God.” Steinmetz, *Reformers in the Wings*, 96.

¹⁰⁶⁰ Undergirding Osiander’s hypothesis is a redemptive historical understanding of Adam which regards his prelapsarian state to be originally righteous on account of having been made in God’s image. This image was thought to consist in the divine Logos, which constituted Adam’s righteousness before God. At the fall, Adam lost the indwelling presence of the Logos and thus lost his original righteousness. In the unfolding of salvation history, however, it was through the incarnation of Jesus Christ that the effects of the fall were ostensibly reversed. When Christ, the “inner Word,” is brought to the soul of the believer through the preaching of the gospel, one is made essentially righteous through the indwelling of Christ, the divine Logos. On this basis one is justified. Seeberg, *Textbook of the History of Doctrines* 371. David C. Steinmetz, *Reformers in the Wings*, 96-97.

Melanchthon and his followers:¹⁰⁶¹ “They teach (doctrines) colder than ice, that we are accounted righteous only on account of the remission of sins, and not also on account of the righteousness of Christ dwelling in us by faith. God is indeed so unjust as to regard him as righteous in whom there is really nothing of true righteousness.”¹⁰⁶² In response to this statement, Reinhold Seeberg concludes, “This citation reveals [Osiander’s] aim. Justification as connected solely with imputation is to his mind an irreligious conception.”¹⁰⁶³

Osiander’s concern to avoid reducing justification to a legal fiction is noteworthy because it is shared by both Newman and Vermigli. As we have seen, this concern is part of what drove Newman to join forensic imputation and internal renewal in the adherent presence of God. It was also a motivating force behind Vermigli’s insistence that justification must on a meaningful level (although not as the fundamental ground) include regeneration and sanctification. In each of these proposals, including Osiander’s, the need to identify justification’s formal cause, and, by extension, the question of how to properly relate forensic imputation and internal renewal, calls for attention.

In addition to Philipp Melanchthon¹⁰⁶⁴ and John Calvin,¹⁰⁶⁵ Peter Martyr expressed opposition to Osiander’s position in his letter to the “Polish Lords and Ministers” in 1556:

We reject as foreign and alien to the Scriptures the ‘essential justice’ which Osiander has invented. We do not recognize any other basis for justification than that which Paul in Romans and Galatians teaches us . . . how righteousness is imputed to us by faith . . . Moreover, if the just live by faith, as Habakkuk has testified, and our justification is our life, we do not now have an essential justification but one imputed by faith, as the apostolic letters have handed down.¹⁰⁶⁶

¹⁰⁶¹ McGrath points out how Melanchthon’s doctrine of justification employed images and categories from the sphere of human law, while Luther drew from the thought world of personal relationships (i.e., human marriage). McGrath, *ID*, 238-239.

¹⁰⁶² Osiander’s *De Justificatione*, 73, cited in Reinhold Seeberg *Textbook of the History of Doctrines*, 369-370.

¹⁰⁶³ *Ibid.*

¹⁰⁶⁴ Philipp Melanchthon, *Melanchthon on Christian Doctrine: Loci Communes 1555*, trans. and ed. Clyde L. Manschreck (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1965; reprint, Grand Rapids: Baker book house, 1982), 168-169.

¹⁰⁶⁵ Calvin refutes Osiander in the final edition of his *Institutes*, 3.11.5-12.

¹⁰⁶⁶ The letter is written from Strasbourg, 14 February 1556, and is found in *Loci Communes* (Zurich: C. Froschauer, 1587), 1114. A recent English translation is found in Donnelly, *Life Letters and Sermons*, 153.

It is noteworthy that Vermigli's assessment of Osiander's position does not mention the problem of Osiander driving a wedge between the natures of Christ when he singles out the divine nature as the basis of justification. Nor does Martyr specifically address the matter of how to properly define the nature of our union with Christ, as Calvin does with his *mystica unio*.¹⁰⁶⁷ Of course, there is every reason to believe that Martyr would have vehemently opposed Osiander on these points;¹⁰⁶⁸ however, what we do observe is Vermigli addressing his critique to Osiander's decision to ground justification in something other than forensic imputation. In making this statement, not only does Vermigli reveal the central concern of his doctrine, he also offers a clue to how he may have responded to Newman's position.

It is also significant that Vermigli's response to Osiander begins and ends with reference to the way in which justification by essential righteousness violates the teaching of Scripture. This is what one might expect, since more than anything else in his *locus* Vermigli is concerned to demonstrate from the Bible the inadequacy of works and the futility of basing justification on anything other than the forensic imputation of divine righteousness.¹⁰⁶⁹ Similar to Calvin who also critiqued Osiander on this point,¹⁰⁷⁰ Vermigli insists that justification cannot be based upon any sort of inherent righteousness but rather on the forensically imputed righteousness of Christ alone.

¹⁰⁶⁷ So Calvin writes, "We do not, therefore, contemplate [Christ] outside ourselves from afar in order that his righteousness may be imputed to us but because we put on Christ and are engrafted into his body—in short, because he deigns to make us one with him." *Institutes*, 3.11.10. For Calvin, solidarity with Christ is always the work of the Holy Spirit who unifies us to Christ.

¹⁰⁶⁸ Vermigli makes it clear that with regard to union it is by the Spirit, *Romanos*, 1196-1197 [102]. With reference to the person and natures of Christ, Vermigli doesn't have a specific volume, but he did engage the subject in a letter written to address a dispute in Poland in 1560 when the Italian theologian Francesco Stancaro (1501-1574) was teaching that Christ is mediator only in his human nature. After the death of Martyr's friend, John a Lasco (1499-1560, also called Jan Łaski), Martyr replaced him in the role of opposing Stancaro by writing to the church in Poland on behalf of the ministers in Zurich (dated May 27, 1560). Martyr asserts in good Chalcedonian fashion that "Christ Jesus is one person in whom the two natures subsist in a way that they are joined with each other so that they cannot in any way be pulled apart from each other." *PMR*, 127-131.

¹⁰⁶⁹ With regard to the ultimate meaning of justification, Vermigli asserts, "Then 'to justify' means that through judgment, words, witness, or assertion one counts the person just" (1182 [88]). This conviction is also illustrated by the overall structure of Martyr's *locus*, that justification is "Not by Works," "It Is by Faith," and "Faith Alone."

¹⁰⁷⁰ So Calvin writes: "When it comes to Scripture, Osiander completely corrupts every passage he cites. In Paul's statement that 'faith is reckoned as righteousness' not for the 'one who works' but for the 'one who believes in him who justifies the ungodly' [Rom. 4:4-5p.], Osiander explains 'justify' as 'to make righteous.'" *Institutes*, 3.11.6.

What do the above observations suggest about the way Vermigli may have responded to Newman? For starters, it is very possible that Vermigli would have affirmed aspects of Newman's doctrine.¹⁰⁷¹ They share a common concern to avoid the reduction of justification to a legal fiction and for giving due attention to the Spirit's ongoing work of renewal in making Christians righteous. They also agree on the need to have forensic imputation as the formal cause by which one is declared righteous and thus made acceptable to God. That is to say, unlike Osiander, Vermigli and Newman recognize the need for attaining forgiveness through a crediting of righteousness. Real and significant as these commonalities are, however, there remains a fundamental element of Newman's position to which Vermigli would fervently protest: Newman's inclusion of internal renewal along with forensic imputation in the formal cause of justification. For Vermigli, this inclusion represents a category confusion which effectively undermines what he regards as the biblical foundation of justification. Because the *sine qua non* of Martyr's doctrine is the reckoning of divine righteousness as the sole fundamental cause of one's forgiveness, Newman's doctrine, in the final analysis, would be unacceptable.

What would Newman have said about Vermigli? Newman would probably have likened Vermigli's position to that of Calvin and Bucer, which Newman describes in his appendix as being quite close to his own.¹⁰⁷² The key difference, according to Newman, concerns the role of faith, which Bucer upholds as "the interposing and acceptable principle between us and God."¹⁰⁷³ While it is likely that Martyr's forceful assertion of *sola fide* would have been off-putting to Newman, reminding him perhaps of those one-dimensional Evangelicals to whom he was reacting,¹⁰⁷⁴ he would have recognized affinity between Vermigli's and Bucer's positions, and a certain compatibility with his own.

¹⁰⁷¹ Given the state of sixteenth century polemics, it is hard to imagine Vermigli saying too many flattering things in response to the Catholic Newman. But if Calvin could affirm a bit of Osiander in the midst of his invectives, it is conceivable that Vermigli could do the same. (Calvin says, for example, "[Osiander] says that we are one with Christ. We agree." *Institutes*, 3.11.5.)

¹⁰⁷² Newman, *Jfc.*, 348 [394]. Elsewhere in his appendix Newman claims that a two-fold righteousness position on justification is more commonly held than one might at first realize. In various places one finds support, says Newman, in such people as Hooker, Mr. Alexander Knox, Calvin, Baxter, and Barrow, 378-384 [420-426].

¹⁰⁷³ *Ibid.*, 348 [426]. In fact it would have been more accurate for Newman to say that Bucer's position posits *imputation* as the interposing principle, accessed through the *instrumentation of faith*.

¹⁰⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, 291-293 [331-333].

Despite the fact that they both include forensic imputation of Christ's righteousness in their doctrines of justification, along with a desire to meaningfully connect justification to the work of the Spirit in producing virtue, Vermigli and Newman differ on the precise nature of justification's formal cause. For Vermigli, this cause is strictly the forensic imputation of Christ's righteousness accessed by faith alone. For Newman, it is the divine presence of God which includes both imputation and internal renewal. Newman is able to recognize an affinity to Vermigli's position in that justification entails a two-fold righteousness. However, Peter Martyr would be unable to reciprocate. As he puts it concerning the basis of justification, it "is not to be looked for from works; it should be enough for us, that the good works we do after justification are sacrifices of thanksgiving (*eucharistika*). Let us not make them propitiatory sacrifices, by which we would do great injury to Christ."¹⁰⁷⁵

B. HABITUS

While this point is perhaps minor compared to the others, it is worth considering. As we have observed, Newman disavows *habitus* as the internal form of righteousness by which one is justified. He does, however, come close to affirming the idea in the *Third Edition* of his *Lectures* when he acknowledges that infusion of an inherent righteousness is the formal ground of justification: "In this then I conceive to lie the unity of Catholic doctrine on the subject of justification, that we are saved by Christ's imputed righteousness, and by our own inchoate righteousness at once."¹⁰⁷⁶ As we noted, this was one of the more significant developments of Newman's doctrine after converting to Catholicism. The basis of his formal cause of justification moved from the forensic imputation of righteousness to the impartation of an inherent righteousness.¹⁰⁷⁷ Even as a Catholic, Newman did not explicitly call this inherent righteousness "*habitus*." However, his description of its capacity to grow, even describing it as "habitual,"¹⁰⁷⁸ suggests that this internal disposition of righteousness is essentially *habitus*.

¹⁰⁷⁵ Vermigli, *Romanos*, 1205 [111].

¹⁰⁷⁶ Newman, *Jfc.*, 368 [414].

¹⁰⁷⁷ As Thomas Holtzen notes in his dissertation, "Union with God and the Holy Spirit: A New Paradigm of Justification" (Ph.D. Diss., Marquette University, 2002), 178.

¹⁰⁷⁸ Newman, *Jfc.*, 164 [188].

By contrast, Peter Marty readily affirms the progressive development of holiness in terms of a “habit” of righteousness.¹⁰⁷⁹ Because men and women in Christ are having their minds and wills renovated by the renewing work of the Holy Spirit, they “cooperate with the power of God.”¹⁰⁸⁰ Such cooperation grows in time and actually becomes a form of *iustitia inhaerens* which leads to further acts of piety.¹⁰⁸¹ This, in Vermigli’s words, is the “inherent righteousness which is rooted in us, which we obtain and confirm by leading a continually upright life.”¹⁰⁸²

At the end of the day, the question of whether Newman and Vermigli agree on this point depends on how one understands the development of Newman’s doctrine from the *First* to the *Third Editions* of his *Lectures*. Those who recognize continuity between these works, will argue that Newman maintains his rejection of *habitus*. For those who think Newman changed his position in a more Catholic direction, Newman’s position came to embrace *habitus*, even without the specific term. The latter of these positions seems more probable.

C. PERSEVERANCE

Given Newman’s insistence on imputed righteousness by Divine Indwelling, one might expect him to have a place for perseverance. Such an expectation is potentially reinforced when Newman makes statements such as the following: “Righteousness then, considered as the state of being God’s temple, cannot be increased; but, considered as the divine glory which that state implies, it can be increased.”¹⁰⁸³ But for Newman there is no guarantee of perseverance. Because the glory of the Spirit in and through a Christian fluctuates in growth, justification itself is also thought to grow (or decline). In like manner, this pneumatic state of being also admits the possibility that one may fall from grace, that is, lose one’s justification. In other words, just as possessing the Spirit amounts to justification, losing the Spirit means

¹⁰⁷⁹ Vermigli, *Romanos*, 1182 [87].

¹⁰⁸⁰ Ibid., 1250 [158]: “et gratia, atque spiritu instauratus cum divina virtute una cooperatur.”

¹⁰⁸¹ Vermigli quotes Augustine with approval “with regard to the righteousness that adheres in us.” (*Augustinum sensisse de iustitia inhaerente*) Ibid., 1320 [226].

¹⁰⁸² Ibid., 1299 [205]: “. . . sed de illa intrinseca nobis inhaerente, quam recte vivendo perpetuo acquirimus, et confirmamus.”

¹⁰⁸³ Newman, *Jfc.*, 151 [168].

that one has jeopardized justification. So Newman writes in one of his *Parochial and Plain Sermons*:

There is no such person under the Gospel as a 'justified sinner,' to use a phrase which is sometimes to be heard. If he is justified and accepted, he has ceased to be a sinner. The Gospel only knows of justified saints; if a saint sins, he ceases to be justified, and becomes a *condemned* sinner. Some persons, I repeat, speak as if men might go on sinning ever so grossly, yet without falling from grace, without the necessity of taking direct and formal means to get back again. They *can* get back, praised be God, but still they *have* to get back, and the error I am speaking of is forgetfulness that they *have* fallen, and *have* to return.¹⁰⁸⁴

By contrast, Vermigli upholds a doctrine of perseverance.¹⁰⁸⁵ In keeping with the conviction that man is unable to secure divine favor by performing good works, Peter Martyr asserts that one who is truly regenerate can do nothing to forfeit his justification. He writes:

In general, it may be stated that faith cannot be completely extinguished because serious sins are committed by the justified and those destined to salvation. In such cases, faith is lulled to sleep and lies hidden and does not burst forth into action unless awakened again by the Holy Spirit. In such fallen ones, the seed of God remains, although for a time it produces no fruit.¹⁰⁸⁶

Vermigli believes that when a regenerate person falls into sin, even sin of a serious nature, that individual's justification remains secure ("the seed of God remains"). Martyr acknowledges that "true faith," sometimes "slips" or is "lulled to sleep," but is not lost.¹⁰⁸⁷ Given his emphasis on the gratuitous and persevering nature of salvation, it is easy for Martyr to say, "Therefore those who seek God, to be justified by him through faith, as the apostle teaches, attain what they desire; but those who would be justified by works fall away from justification."¹⁰⁸⁸ The doctrine of perseverance reveals that for all of their similarities, the variation between Newman and Vermigli is nevertheless significant.

¹⁰⁸⁴ Newman, *PPS*, 5.13, 1079.

¹⁰⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, 1253-1254 [160-161], 1292-1293 [198-200], 1315-1316 [221-222].

¹⁰⁸⁶ Vermigli, *Romanos*, 1278 [186].

¹⁰⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, 1302 [208]: "amitti... aut ita consopiri ut suum."

¹⁰⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, 1288 [194]: "Quare, qui quaerunt Deum ut ab eo iustificentur ex fide, quemadmodum Apostolus docet, assequuntur id, quod optant: Illi vero, qui iustificari volunt ex operibus, exicidunt a iustificatione."

V. Conclusion

This chapter has compared and contrasted salient elements of Newman's and Vermigli's doctrine of justification. In view of their common concerns (i.e., the danger of meritorious works, cheap grace, and a proper relationship between forensic and actual righteousness) and common theological commitments (i.e., an Augustinian hamartology, union with Christ, the need for a forensic imputation, the internal renewal of the Holy Spirit, and *duplex iustitia*), the notion of *duplex iustitia* has served as a heuristic lens for understanding the reasons that motivate their respective doctrines. Following from these concerns, twofold righteousness also sheds light on reasons and methods by which these doctrines are constructed, illustrating how a commitment to upholding both forensic *and* operative righteousness encourages theological decisions that are shared by Roman Catholics and Reformed Protestants.

The above mentioned commonalities have implications for interaction at the Roman Catholic and Reformed Protestant intersection. On a practical level, for example, a shared concern for the danger of meritorious works and cheap grace will lead both traditions to carefully articulate and qualify their doctrines of justification in order to avoid these errors. Common theological commitments such as an Augustinian view of sin, union with Christ, and the dynamic work of the Holy Spirit are also points of agreement. At the very least, this recognition of commonalities has the power to ameliorate the unfortunate tendency of reacting to the other tradition by retreating from elements that truly belong to a doctrine of justification, such as when Protestants categorically deny the fructifying role of the Spirit or when Catholics refuse to recognize the possibility of forensic imputation.

We have also noted, however, that just because two theologians agree on *duplex iustitia* in the context of justification, doesn't mean that they will agree fully. Newman and Vermigli illustrate this in spades. Despite the aforementioned affinity of Newman's and Vermigli's doctrine, they maintain fundamentally different commitments on key points (i.e., the sacramental framework of justification and *sola fide*) which naturally drive them toward divergent conclusions, particularly with reference to justification's formal cause, the existence of a disposition [*habitus*], and the doctrine of perseverance. In the concluding chapter of this thesis we will reflect on the implications of these differences, and our similarities, for contemporary Roman Catholic and Reformed Protestant dialogue.

Chapter Six

Justification in Contemporary Roman Catholic and Reformed Theology

A. Justification in Contemporary Ecumenical Focus

This study has sought to demonstrate meaningful convergence between the Roman Catholic and Reformed Protestant (represented by Peter Martyr Vermigli) doctrines of justification. In this concluding chapter, we will reflect upon opportunities and challenges to Roman Catholic and Reformed Protestant rapprochement by examining points of agreement and difference that have come to light in our research. We will do so around six key issues:

- Human Powerlessness and Divine Initiative
- Justification's Formal Cause
- Concupiscence or Sin?
- Faith Alone and Works
- Assurance of Faith
- The Role of Merit

Before examining the issues, we will say a word about the ecumenical moment in which we live. Recent discussions between Roman Catholics and Protestants have moved beyond the stereotypical approaches to justification. A prime example of this progress is found in the *Joint Declaration on the Doctrine of Justification (JD)* between the Lutheran World Federation and the Roman Catholic Church, signed in Augsburg on October 31, 1999 commemorating Luther's *Ninety-Five Theses*.¹⁰⁸⁹ Especially indebted to the American report entitled *Justification by Faith* (1983) and *The Condemnations of the Reformation Era: Do They Still Divide?* from Germany,¹⁰⁹⁰ the *JD* represents a culmination of previous documents.¹⁰⁹¹

¹⁰⁸⁹ The Lutheran World Federation and The Roman Catholics Church, *Joint Declaration on the Doctrine of Justification*. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000). (Hereafter abbreviated as *JD*).

¹⁰⁹⁰ *JD*, §§1-3. For the history leading to the *JD*, see "Can the Sixteenth Century Condemnations on Justification be Declared Nonapplicable?: An Introduction" in *Justification by Faith: Do the Sixteenth-Century Condemnations Still Apply?* Ed. Karl Lehmann et al. (New York: Continuum, 1997), 1-20; John A. Rando. *Lutheran & Catholic Reconciliation on Justification*. (Grand

The task of enlisting support for the *JD* in wider Catholic and Lutheran communities became a significant challenge. Toward this end, a draft was distributed in 1995 and feedback solicited among church leaders in both communities. The first iteration of the *JD* was then published in 1997 followed by a period of conversation. The disagreement that ensued on both sides of the ecclesial fence has been well documented.¹⁰⁹² Such debate culminated in the Vatican's "Official Response" on June 25, 1998, which seemed to undermine prospects of a joint signing. Before discussions deteriorated, however, a propitiatory annex addressing critical points of ambiguity was added thus allowing both sides to sign the "Official Common Statement." This "Annex to the Official Common Statement" officially belongs to the *JD*.

The text of the *JD* is remarkably brief compared to previous documents (cf. *Justification by Faith*, 1983).¹⁰⁹³ Nevertheless, because it has been formally accepted by the Roman Catholic Church at the highest level, it is recognized as "the most significant report"

Rapids; Eerdmans, 2009), 1-165. For a broader treatment of the theological history behind the document, see Paul O'Callaghan. *Fides Christi: The Justification Debate*. (Dublin, Four Courts Press, 1997). It is also worth reading the "Background Papers" in *Justification by Faith: Lutherans and Catholics in Dialogue VII*. Edited by H George Anderson et al. (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1985), 75-315.

¹⁰⁹¹ *JD*, §6. Early antecedents, according to Henri A. Blocher, include the work of Roman Catholic theologian W. H. van de Pol of Nijmegen as early as 1948, Hans Küng's dissertation entitled *Justification: The Doctrine of Karl Barth and a Catholic Reflection* (1957), and the "Malta Report" of 1971, published in 1972. "The Lutheran-Catholic Declaration on Justification" in *Justification in Perspective: Historical Developments and Contemporary Challenges*. Ed. Bruce L McCormack. (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2006) 197-217.

¹⁰⁹² Lane, *Justification by Faith*, 120-122; Blocher, "The Lutheran-Catholic Declaration," 198-199; Radano, *Lutheran & Catholic Reconciliation*, 146-165.

¹⁰⁹³ The *JD* consists of a Preamble (§§1-7) providing historical prologue, the "Biblical Message of Justification (§§8-12), followed by a brief section titled "The Doctrine of Justification as Ecumenical Problem," where it addresses the application of the sixteenth century condemnations (§13). Thirdly, "The Common Understanding of Justification" identifies mutual commitments (§§14-18), followed by the largest section, "Explicating the Common Understanding of Justification (§§19-39), which analyses seven key issues: "Human Powerlessness and Sin in Relation to Justification" (4.1), "Justification as Forgiveness of Sins and Making Righteous" (4.2), "Justification by Faith through Grace" (4.3), "The Justified as Sinner" (4.4), "Law and Gospel" (4.5), Assurance of Salvation (4.6), "The Good Works of the Justified" (4.7). The fifth section, "The Significance and Scope of the Consensus Reached" (§§40-44), is quite brief, and it is followed by the "Sources for the *Joint Declaration on the Doctrine of Justification*," a sampling of materials from previous dialogues that support conclusions drawn in the *JD*. Finally, following the "Official Common Statement," is the "Annex" which seeks to address issues where the preceding has failed to produce sufficient consensus.

on justification.¹⁰⁹⁴ The *JD* is also significant for its stated goal of officially rescinding the mutual anathemas of the sixteenth century, that is, insofar as one understands justification “presented in this *Declaration*.”¹⁰⁹⁵ Still, the sixteenth century condemnations are to be taken seriously as “salutary warnings.”¹⁰⁹⁶

Despite its agreement, the *JD* also acknowledges ongoing differences between Lutherans and Catholics on seven key issues connected to the doctrine of justification.¹⁰⁹⁷ But it describes them not as bona fide doctrinal differences as much as discrepancies “of language, theological elaboration, and emphasis” and proceeds to say they are recognized as “acceptable” (instead of sitting in the crosshairs of anathematizing canons).¹⁰⁹⁸ Avery Cardinal Dulles regards the term “acceptable” as poorly chosen and would have preferred the word “tolerable.”¹⁰⁹⁹ Fair enough. But even with such shortcomings, the *JD* is recognized as offering the most current and authoritative statement on justification among Catholics and Protestants.¹¹⁰⁰

Finally, in dialogue or in analysis such as this, it is important to note that a comparison of contemporary Protestant and Roman Catholic belief is always asymmetrical insofar as Catholicism possesses a magisterial authority that is binding upon the consciences of her faithful, with a source where such teaching is summarized, namely the *Catechism of*

¹⁰⁹⁴ Lane, *Justification by Faith*, 124. Avery Cardinal Dulles highlights the fact that there is ambiguity in the degree of authority to which the *JD* can lay claim. He writes, “Granting that Cardinal Cassidy was authorized to sign, Catholics still wonder whether the Pontifical Council for Promoting Christian Unity can make binding pronouncements about matters of doctrine and whether it did so in this case. Can the *JD* be properly regarded as a statement of the Catholic magisterium?” Avery Cardinal Dulles. “Justification and the Unity of the Church” in *The Gospel of Justification in Christ: Where Does the Church Stand Today?* Edited by Wayne C. Sturm. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006), 126.

¹⁰⁹⁵ *JD*, §§ 41-44.

¹⁰⁹⁶ *Ibid.*, §§ 42.

¹⁰⁹⁷ Therefore, it is called the “Joint Declaration” (*Gemeinsame Erklärung*) and not the “Common Confession of Our Faith.”

¹⁰⁹⁸ *JD*, §§ 40.

¹⁰⁹⁹ Dulles notes that the English text differs from the German in which the word “*tragbar*” (tolerable) is used instead of “*annehmbar*” (acceptable), “Justification and the Unity of the Church,” 127.

¹¹⁰⁰ The World Methodist Council officially associated with the *JD* in Seoul, South Korea, on July 23, 2006. For a Reformed perspective on the *JD* in the context of assessing contemporary Lutheran and Reformed approaches to justification, see Gabriel Fackre, “Affirmations and Admonitions: Lutheran and Reformed,” *The Gospel of Justification in Christ: Where Does the Church Stand Today?* Edited by Wayne C. Sturm. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006), 1-26.

the Catholic Church.¹¹⁰¹ Protestants (even if the scope is narrowed to the “Reformed” tradition) have no such source.¹¹⁰² Therefore, in the following evaluation, we will concentrate on a few particular sources: the Council of Trent’s *Decree on Justification* (1547), the *Catechism of the Catholic Church* (1994), and the *Joint Declaration on the Doctrine of Justification* (1999).¹¹⁰³ Peter Martyr Vermigli will represent a Reformed Protestant approach. Readers can decide for themselves the extent to which Peter Martyr is a suitable representative of Reformed Protestantism. Finally, we will also note points where John Henry Newman’s doctrine of justification may illumine fresh opportunities for rapprochement.

B. Human Powerlessness & Divine Initiative

The Council of Trent was quite clear in its *Decree on Original Sin* that the damage done by humanity in Adam, that is, in original sin, could not be repaired by efforts of human nature or by any other means besides the merit of Christ.¹¹⁰⁴ In the same paragraph it also emphasizes the sacrament of baptism as mediating this merit which brings forgiveness and new life. These two convictions—that humans are naturally guilty before God and God comes to their rescue through Christ in the sacrament of baptism—lay essential groundwork for understanding the Catholic doctrine of justification.

The Council’s *Decree on Justification* begins by revisiting the portrait of humanity’s “unclean” condition as described by the *Decree on Original Sin*. Neither the forces of nature

¹¹⁰¹ Concerning the nature and purpose of the *Catechism*, it says of itself: “This catechism aims at presenting an organic synthesis of the essential and fundamental contents of Catholic doctrine, as regards both faith and morals, in the light of the Second Vatican Council and the whole of the Church’s Tradition. Its principal sources are the Sacred Scriptures, the Fathers of the Church, the liturgy, and the Church’s Magisterium. It is intended to serve “as a point of reference for the catechisms or compendia that are composed in the various countries” *Catechism of the Catholic Church*, Ed. 2 (Citta del Vaticano: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 1997), para, 11. Hereafter abbreviated as CCC.

¹¹⁰² Confessions such as The Belgic Confession (1561), The Heidelberg Confession (1563), and The Westminster Confession of Faith (1647), have enduring value, but there is no single Reformed confession that has a binding nature quite like the Catholic *Catechism*.

¹¹⁰³ The Second Vatican Council offered little explicit attention to the doctrine of justification; however, it indirectly addresses the subject in its teaching on such themes as grace, faith, salvation, and the ministrations of the church. The following study indicates the few places where this is relevant.

¹¹⁰⁴ *Decree on Original Sin*, ch. 5, esp. §3. CCC, §§1849-1850, §§1871-1873 (cf. §1987, §1990, §2017, §2019).

nor the Law of Moses can provide liberation from the corrupting and condemning power of sin. Human assets are simply insufficient. It is only by God's grace given through the passion of Christ that one acquires the ability to move in the direction of righteousness.¹¹⁰⁵ This "predisposing grace," which God imparts, is the initial step in one's conversion (when he or she is transferred from sin to forgiveness), and by the empowerment of the Holy Spirit it enables one to "freely assent to and cooperate with this same grace."¹¹⁰⁶ Thus, God empowers one to freely repent, believe, hope, love and keep the commandments.¹¹⁰⁷

We have observed how Peter Martyr vigorously repudiates the idea that one can dispose himself for justification through willful cooperation (despite the fact that it is on the basis of God's empowering grace). After making his point against Trent, Martyr then quips, "What else would Pelagius say if he were now alive?"¹¹⁰⁸ For Vermigli, it is not a "predisposing grace" empowering one's volition that results in justifying faith; it is the complete renewal of the heart from stone to flesh that "fully persuades, bends, and changes the will."¹¹⁰⁹ He thus concludes, "Our men of Trent do indeed grant that God renews the heart of man by illumination of the Holy Spirit. However, so that a man himself should do something, they add that the man who admits such inspiration may also reject it." For Vermigli, the Tridentine understanding of human volition is guilty of "works" righteousness and thus amounts to Pelagianism.¹¹¹⁰

As Vermigli illustrates, to the extent that human will contributes to justification, Reformed Protestantism is inclined to dissent from the Catholic position. This dissention, however, should not prevent Reformed Protestants from recognizing their agreement with Catholics in the basic conviction that God's intervening grace in some way enables one to

¹¹⁰⁵ *Decree on Justification*, ch. 2.

¹¹⁰⁶ *Ibid.*, ch. 5.

¹¹⁰⁷ *Ibid.*, ch. 6.

¹¹⁰⁸ Vermigli, *Romanos*, 1249-1250 [156-157].

¹¹⁰⁹ *Ibid.*

¹¹¹⁰ *Ibid.* Other places where Vermigli conveys this same concern are found in *Romanos*, 1216 [123], 1218-20 [125-126]. Vermigli grants and approves other kinds of preparation, that is, experiences that lead to one faith. However, he is emphatic that salvation should not be ascribed to such experiences. "Indeed," he writes, "they are instead enemies of our salvation." 1219-1220 [126].

believe (call it “prevenient grace” if you like).¹¹¹¹ Accordingly, the most significant differences between Vermigli and Rome are twofold: the delivery system—the instrumental means by which the Holy Spirit and his gifts are imparted (the sacraments compared to *sola fide*)—and the ultimate basis of one’s acceptance (the formal cause). We shall consider these differences in due course; but for the moment we are interested in recognizing the common commitment to upholding divine initiative in justification. In the words of Trent, chapter seven:

For though no one can be just unless the merits of the passion of our Lord Jesus Christ are communicated to him; nevertheless, in the justification of a sinner this in fact takes place when, by the merit of the same most holy passion, the love of God is poured out by the agency of the holy Spirit in the hearts of those who are being justified, and abides in them. Consequently, in this process of justification, together with the forgiveness of sins a person received, through Jesus Christ into whom he is grafted, all these infused at the same time: faith, hope and charity.¹¹¹²

The same note is hit by the *Catechism of the Catholic Church*:

The first work of the grace of the Holy Spirit is conversion, effecting justification in accordance with Jesus’ proclamation at the beginning of the Gospel: “Repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand.” Moved by grace, man turns toward God and away from sin, thus accepting forgiveness and righteousness from on high. “Justification is not only the remission of sins, but also the sanctification and renewal of the interior man.”¹¹¹³

¹¹¹¹ Over against the medieval notion of congruent merit, the Council of Trent asserted the idea that anything preceding justification is incapable of meriting the impartation of justifying grace (*Decree on Justification*, chs. five, six & eight). In chapter eight, it states that nothing prior “*promeretur*” to justification can merit the grace of justification. Certain Franciscans of the period argued that using “*promeretur*” rather than “*meretur*” excludes meriting justification by condign merit, but not by congruous merit (this argument is predicated on the belief that *mereri* and *promereri* equate to congruous and condign merit). However, in light of chapters five and six of Trent’s *Decree on Justification*, where they underscore the need for a divinely imparted predisposing grace, such an interpretation seems highly unlikely. Heiko Oberman offers a detailed examination of the history of interpretation surrounding *promeretur* in his volume, *The Dawn of the Reformation. Essays in Late Medieval and Early Reformation Thought*. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1986), 222-233. In the words of the Catholic *Catechism*, “God brings to completion in us what he has begun...” (CCC, §2001. Cf. §1996, §1998, §1999, §§2002-2003).

¹¹¹² *Decree on Justification*, ch. 7.

¹¹¹³ CCC, §1989. This point is also made in §§1987-1988. Along this line, *Lumen Gentium* 14 asserts that, “All the sons of the Church should remember that their exalted status is to be attributed not to their own merits but to the special grace of Christ.”

Finally, the *JD* also safeguards divine initiative when it asserts that every salutary act directed at salvation relies on divine grace and that no action prior to justification is strictly meritorious:

We confess together that all persons depend completely on the saving grace of God for their salvation. The freedom they possess in relation to persons and the things of this world is no freedom in relation to salvation, for as sinners they stand under God's judgment and are incapable of turning by themselves to God to seek deliverance, of meriting their justification before God, or of attaining salvation by their own abilities. Justification takes place solely by God's grace.¹¹¹⁴

C. Justification's Formal Cause

If contemporary Catholicism were to embrace Newman's notion of justification by divine indwelling, agreement at the Catholic/Protestant intersection would go significantly deeper.¹¹¹⁵ To this point, the critical question is whether Newman's theology of union with Christ by the adherent presence of God is consistent with Trent's single formal cause. As we noted, in his advertisement of his Third Edition (1874), the Catholic Newman exploits the ambiguous nature of the *unica forma causa*, pointing to other post-Tridentine Catholic authors who likewise propose an option other than a habitual or actual form of inherent righteousness. Newman is convinced that because chapter seven of Trent's *Decree* simply states that justification's formal cause is "the righteous of God... by which he makes us righteous" without explicating its precise nature, his position on justification by divine indwelling is a plausible option. If Rome were to accept Newman's proposal on this point, a greater amount of agreement could be reached with Protestants on their most fundamental discrepancy: justification's formal cause.

If, as Newman argues, justification consists in the indwelling presence of God, Catholics would have the freedom to recognize justification's formal cause to be every bit as

¹¹¹⁴ *JD*, §19. Cf. §17 "[The New Testament] tells us that because we are sinners our new life is solely due to the forgiving and renewing mercy that God imparts as a gift and we receive in faith, and never can merit in any way."

¹¹¹⁵ This is assuming that the Catholic Newman's doctrine of justification vis-à-vis *gratia increata* (as expressed in the Third Edition of his *Lectures* from 1874) remained consistent with the *via media* of the original 1838 version of his *Lectures*.

forensic as it is operative.¹¹¹⁶ And because this position admits the simultaneous reception of sanctifying righteousness, the Catholic concern for justification to feed and manifest itself in ethics (i.e. faith, hope, and love) is properly accounted for. Thus, the debate no longer turns on whether justification is strictly forensic or operative. According to Newman, it is both. A more significant dividing line, in this case, is whether justification is simply a forensic declaration of Christ's righteousness (as some forms of Protestantism would contend, such as the traditional Lutheran view)¹¹¹⁷ or the reception of Christ's righteousness by the indwelling Spirit (which Vermigli affirms).

In favor of Newman's emphasis on this divine indwelling, we read the following statements in the Catholic *Catechism*:¹¹¹⁸

Grace is a *participation in the life of God*. Grace is *favor*, the *free and underserved help* that God gives us to respond to his call to become children of God, adoptive sons, partakers of the divine nature and of eternal life.¹¹¹⁹

The grace of Christ is the gratuitous gift that God makes to us of his own life, included by the Holy Spirit into our soul to heal it of sin and to sanctify it. It is the *sanctifying or deifying grace* received in Baptism. It is in us the source of the work of sanctification.¹¹²⁰

Filial adoption, in making us partakers by grace in the divine nature, can bestow true merit on us as a result of God's gratuitous justice....¹¹²¹

¹¹¹⁶ Concerning the forensic nature of this work, we have noted Newman's assertion that justification is "glorious Voice of the Lord" declaring us to be righteous. That it is a declaration not a making, is sufficiently clear from this one argument that it is the justification of a *sinner*, of one who *has been* a sinner; and the past cannot be reversed except by *accounting* it reversed" (*Jfc*. 67 [71-72]).

¹¹¹⁷ So Luther writes about the righteousness of justification, "It is a great thing so to lift oneself up and to walk in a foreign [literally "alien"] righteousness, one that lies outside yourself, one you neither see nor understand but hear in the Word alone." *What Luther Says, An Anthology*, vol. 3, ed. Ewald M. Plass. (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1959), 1229.

¹¹¹⁸ In support of adherent presence, Trent says in chapter sixteen, "Thus our own personal justice is not established as something coming from us, nor is the justice of God disregarded or rejected; what is called our justice, because we are justified by its abiding in us, is that same justice of God, in that it is imparted to us by God through the merit of Christ." N.P. Tanner (ed.), *Decrees*, 2:678.

¹¹¹⁹ CCC, §1997

¹¹²⁰ CCC, §1999

¹¹²¹ CCC, §2009.

These quotations demonstrate that contemporary Catholic teaching recognizes and affirms a considerable amount of Newman's central thesis: that justification is by grace on account of divine indwelling. But do Trent and the *Catechism* actually permit such a position in what they say elsewhere? In other words, is the adherent presence of God completely sufficient for justification or does an individual also need to manifest an inherent righteousness (either habitual or in works)?

At the very least, Newman's argument appears to be in accord with the requirement of *initial* justification; however, it is not so clear whether divine indwelling is entirely sufficient for justification beyond this point. For example, in the context of defining justification's formal cause, chapter seven of Trent's *Decree* says justification is that by which God "makes us just and endowed with which we are renewed in the spirit of our mind... according to the measure which the holy Spirit apportions to each one as he wills, and in view of each one's dispositions and co-operations."¹¹²² This language sounds a lot like the sort of habit of righteousness that Newman disavows. The Catholic *Catechism* conveys the same idea:

Sanctifying grace is an habitual gift, a stable and supernatural disposition that perfects the soul itself to enable it to live with God, to act by his love. *Habitual grace*, the permanent disposition to live and act in keeping with God's call, is distinguished from actual graces which refer to God's interventions, whether at the beginning of conversion or in the course of the works of sanctification.¹¹²³

Nevertheless, there are reasons why Catholics may still find Newman's formulation tenable. Even though he maintains *gratia increata* as the ground of forgiveness, we have observed how he seeks to also include internal renewal as part of that ground. Hence:

[The] Gift which justifies us is, as we have seen, a something distinct from us and lodged in us, yet it involves in its idea its own work in us, and (as it were) takes up into itself that renovation of the soul, those holy deeds and sufferings, which are as if a radiance streaming from it.¹¹²⁴

¹¹²² *Decree on Justification*, chap. 7.

¹¹²³ CCC, §2000.

¹¹²⁴ Newman, *Jfc.*, 178 [207].

Some would accuse Newman of slicing the onion a little too thin at this point.¹¹²⁵ He is arguing for the causality of uncreated grace over *habitus*—which suggests disagreement with the Catholic position—but, at the same time, he insists that this presence includes under its meaning the act of “making righteous.”¹¹²⁶ Is this claim to internal renewal genuine enough to carry the transformational freight demanded by Trent and the *Catechism*? “No,” responds the skeptic, “since Newman posits a notional distinction between the (forensically) justifying word and the (actual) renewal by the Spirit.”¹¹²⁷ But this is where it gets complicated. One recalls that in his 1874 edition (writing as a Catholic), Newman retracted this distinction (that “justification is perfectly distinct from renewal”)¹¹²⁸ to suggest that sanctification and justification are simultaneous.¹¹²⁹ If this is in fact Newman’s position, there appears to be greater compatibility with Roman Catholic doctrine. Unfortunately, while Newman removes the wedge in the above-mentioned statement, he fails to do so in the appendix of his third edition, where he asserts that “incipient righteousness, which is the improper form [of justification], is but the necessary attendant on the Divine Presence, which is the proper.”¹¹³⁰ Therefore, as we concluded in chapter four, faced with this ambiguity, readers will have to decide for themselves which of these two positions more accurately reflects the Catholic Newman.

In addition to considering whether Newman’s formal cause developed in a Rome-ward direction, we need to also consider whether Rome has moved any closer to the *duplex iustitia* positions represented by Vermigli and Newman. A.N.S. Lane reminds us that what

¹¹²⁵ Jose Morales, “Newman and the Problems of Justification,” in *Newman Today: Papers Presented at a Conference on John Henry Cardinal Newman*, ed. Stanley L. Jaki, The Proceedings of the Wethersfield Institute 1 (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1989), 143-164.

¹¹²⁶ Newman writes, “[T]o ‘justify’ means in itself ‘counting righteous,’ but includes *under* its meaning ‘making righteous;’ in other words, the sense of the *term* is ‘counting righteous,’ and the nature of the *thing* denoted by it is making righteous.” *Jfc.*, 65 [70].

¹¹²⁷ Newman writes in his 1838 edition, “Of course, all that is said on this subject must be a mystery after all; yet so much we may now say, that if the justifying Word be attended by the spiritual entrance of Christ in the soul, justification is perfectly distinct from renewal, with which the Roman Schools identify it, yet directly productive of it, which strict Protestants deny.” *Jfc.*, [170-171].

¹¹²⁸ Newman, *Jfc.* First Edition, (1838) [170-171].

¹¹²⁹ Newman states that the “word of justification is the substantive living Word of God, entering the soul, illuminating and cleansing it, as fire brightens and purifies material substances. He who justifies also sanctifies, because it is He.” Newman, *Jfc.*, (1874), 154.

¹¹³⁰ Newman, *Jfc.* (1874), 381-382

Rome said about justification at the Council of Trent it said “at a time in response to what it then understood the Reformers to be saying.”¹¹³¹ Therefore, as Lane continues to explain, we must listen carefully to contemporary Catholic theology to understand the nuances of its current position, especially as it relates to Protestantism. In this regard, there is an interesting statement in the Catholic *Catechism* that might be understood as a tacit approval of imputation, at least to the extent that those who have already been justified have an ongoing need for Christ’s righteousness as superior to their own. At the conclusion of the section on the role of merit in justification, where it takes up the matter of the charity of Christ as the source in us of all merit before God, there is the following quotation from Thérèse of Lisieux. Catholic ecumenists can decide whether this emphasis opens the door widely enough to admit any of Newman’s doctrine.

After earth's exile, I hope to go and enjoy you in the fatherland, but I do not want to lay up merits for heaven. I want to work for your *love alone*. . . . In the evening of this life, I shall appear before you with empty hands, for I do not ask you, Lord, to count my works. All our justice is blemished in your eyes. I wish, then, to be clothed in your own *justice* and to receive from your love the eternal possession of *yourself*.¹¹³²

Avery Cardinal Dulles explains that with regard to the question of whether righteousness is imputed or inherent, twentieth-century Catholic theology has emphasized the notion of *gratia increata*. Accordingly, “the righteousness of the creature,” says Dulles, “always remains a gift; it is a participation in the righteousness of God, given in Christ.”¹¹³³ While Catholics do not employ the language of “imputation” in the same way as Reformed Protestants to describe the reckoning of Christ’s righteousness as the sole ground of one’s forgiveness, they are nevertheless keen to underscore the fact that our righteousness is derived from our participation in Christ. Thus, Dulles concludes, “In that sense the Reformation categories of *iustitia aliena* and “imputed righteousness” convey an important truth that Catholics do not wish to ignore.”¹¹³⁴

¹¹³¹ Lane, *Justification by Faith*, 85.

¹¹³² CCC, §2011.

¹¹³³ Dulles, “Contemporary Catholic Theology,” 258. Dulles highlights Karl Rahner’s argument as exemplary, “that ‘created grace’ is an essentially relative entity, having no absolute existence of its own.”

¹¹³⁴ Ibid.

The *JD* does not use the term “impute” to identify the basis on which the converted Christian is accepted by God.¹¹³⁵ The closest it comes to providing an answer is §15 where it says that by “grace alone, in faith in Christ’s saving work and not because of any merit on our part, we are accepted by God and received the Holy Spirit, who renews our hearts....” While acceptance and renewal both appear in this statement, it is possible to understand the latter to follow from the former.¹¹³⁶ It is of course also possible for this pattern to be limited to initial justification (and not one’s ongoing status), in which case the *JD* is simply reiterating the teaching of Trent. Unfortunately, the *JD* is ambiguous on this particular point.

When Vermigli directed his critiques toward Trent, the major target was what he perceived to be the heresy of “Pelagianism.”¹¹³⁷ We noted that this was not entirely fair since Trent, unlike Pelagius, insisted that justification comes as a “free gift” since it is impossible for one to naturally please God.¹¹³⁸ Nevertheless, Peter Martyr goes to great lengths to oppose the notion of grounding justification in the Spirit’s work *in nobis*, arguing instead for Christ’s imputed righteousness *pro nobis* as the fundamental basis of justification: “Therefore, we say that justification cannot consist in that righteousness and renewal by which we are created anew by God. For it is imperfect because of our corruption, so that we are not able to stand before the judgment of Christ.”¹¹³⁹ For Peter Martyr, sinners are accounted righteous because Christ’s righteousness is forensically reckoned to them.¹¹⁴⁰

In short, our study has illustrated that the fundamental difference between the Roman Catholic and Reformed Protestant doctrines of justification comes down to the “formal cause.” Even if Newman’s concept of God’s adherent presence is applied, Reformed

¹¹³⁵ The verb “to impute” only appears in §22 (“God no longer imputes to them their sin”) of the nonimputation of guilt. The word “reckoned” appears in §10. A “declaration of forgiveness” is mentioned in §23 in summarizing the Lutheran position.

¹¹³⁶ A.N.S. Lane makes this point in *Justification by Faith*, 167.

¹¹³⁷ Vermigli, *Romanos*, 1248-49 [156].

¹¹³⁸ Chapter eight of the Council’s *Decree on Justification* explicitly states that justification comes as a “free gift,” and does so on the perennial consent of the Catholic Church, on the basis of faith, “without which ‘it is impossible to please God’” (Heb 11:6). *Decree on Justification*, ch. 8 in N.P. Tanner (ed.), *Decrees*, 2:674.

¹¹³⁹ Vermigli, *Romanos*, 1252 [159].

¹¹⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, 1182 [88]; 1251-1252 [159].

Protestants still oppose the combination of forensic imputation and internal renewal as the proper cause of justification, since doing so fails to produce the perfect righteousness that is required to meet the demands of divine holiness.¹¹⁴¹

D. Concupiscence or Sin?

Peter Martyr agrees with Rome on the fact that those who have been justified continue to have concupiscence, that is, Christians still possess an inclination toward evil despite the indwelling presence of the Spirit.¹¹⁴² His opposition to Rome on this point centers on the question of its status. Is concupiscence simply an inclination to sin, or does the inclination itself constitute sin? Vermigli chooses the latter, recognizing sin as an ongoing obstacle to fellowship with God, which only the imputation of Christ's righteousness can remedy.¹¹⁴³ By contrast, the Council of Trent, in its "Decree on Original Sin," unequivocally opted for the former.¹¹⁴⁴ In the words of the Catholic *Catechism*:

Conversion to Christ, the new birth of Baptism, the gift of the Holy Spirit and the Body and Blood of Christ received as food have made us "holy and without blemish," just as the Church herself, the Bride of Christ, is "holy and without blemish." Nevertheless the new life received in Christian initiation has not abolished the frailty and weakness of human nature, nor the inclination to sin that tradition calls concupiscence, which remains in the baptized such that with the help of the grace of Christ they may prove themselves in the struggle of Christian life. This is the struggle of conversion directed toward holiness and eternal life to which the Lord never ceases to call us.¹¹⁴⁵

It is interesting to note that this is another place where the Catholic Newman revised his position in conformity to the teaching of Rome. In his Third Edition (1874), for instance,

¹¹⁴¹ Ibid., 1182 [88]; 1252 [159].

¹¹⁴² For instance, Martyr makes this point from the Lord's Prayer, "Moreover, the Son of God commanded believers to say in their prayers, 'Forgive us our trespasses.' This shows that the faithful also need forgiveness for the things they do, for our works are not perfect nor are they able to satisfy." Ibid., 1207 [113].

¹¹⁴³ From the beginning of his *Locus*, Martyr asserts that . . . "'to justify' comes by way of judging or accounting, to ascribe righteousness to someone and not make him just in reality. . . ." Vermigli, *Romanos*, 1183 [88-89]: Cf. 1194 [100]. More explicitly, he states "that justification cannot consist in that righteousness and renewal by which we are created anew by God. For it is imperfect because of our corruption, so that we are not able to stand before the judgment of Christ." 1252 [159].

¹¹⁴⁴ "Decree on Original Sin," Ch. Five.

¹¹⁴⁵ CCC, §1426.

he qualifies the following statement: “For we must consider that since we are ever falling into sin and incurring God’s wrath, we are ever being justified again and again by His grace.”¹¹⁴⁶ With regard to “ever falling into sin and incurring God’s wrath,” Newman includes a footnote: “This is incorrect. If by ‘sin’ is meant grievous sin, those who are in the grace of God need not ever be falling into it; and if lighter sins are meant, these do not bring us back again under ‘God’s wrath.’”¹¹⁴⁷

The question of the status of concupiscence continues to be a point of contention between contemporary Catholics and Protestants. Avery Cardinal Dulles explains why this is the case:

Trent unequivocally taught the reality of the transition from unrighteousness to righteousness that occurs in justification. It denied that grace consists merely in God’s favor or in the nonimputation of sins.... For this reason Catholics remain to this day somewhat nervous about the formula, *simul iustus et peccator*, which might suggest that we are justified only in hope or in a purely nominalistic way that leaves us internally untouched.¹¹⁴⁸

This thesis has not deduced the doctrine of *simul iustus et peccator* from Peter Martyr’s teaching, since he does not actually employ the phrase. However, we agree with Frank James who makes a compelling case that despite Martyr’s reticence in explicating the formula, the concept is alive and well in his theology.¹¹⁴⁹ In light of this, the anthropology of the *JD*, in keeping with Trent, differs from Martyr and the Reformed tradition insofar as it regards concupiscence as not strictly sin in the “proper sense” and “does not merit the punishment of eternal death.”¹¹⁵⁰ At the same time, the *JD* upholds the Lutheran *simul* in a way that affirms that we are “totally sinners” according to the law, while also recognizing that one’s inclination to sin is also ruled by Christ such that “Christians can in part lead a just life.”¹¹⁵¹ Disagreement on this subject became a point of contention that resulted in continued clarification in the Annex where a mutually agreeable balance was sought. This

¹¹⁴⁶ Newman, *Jfc.*, 101.

¹¹⁴⁷ Ibid.

¹¹⁴⁸ Dulles, “In Contemporary Catholic Theology,” 269.

¹¹⁴⁹ James, “The Complex of Justification,” 51-52.

¹¹⁵⁰ *JD*, §30.

¹¹⁵¹ *JD*, §29.

balance highlighted the reality of spiritual renewal (2 Cor 5:17) while simultaneously requiring Christians to pray “God, be merciful to me, a sinner” (Luke 18:13).¹¹⁵² To this extent, at least, Catholics and Protestants have a synoptic view.

E. Faith Alone and Works

Disagreement over the status of concupiscence is related to another genuine difference between Catholics and Protestants, namely the instrumental cause or means by which one is justified. Whereas Rome teaches baptismal regeneration, Peter Martyr asserts that justification is accessed by faith alone. Since Rome maintains that in baptism one receives “the forgiveness of all sins and the gift of new life,”¹¹⁵³ it is in her view impossible for two contradictory states to simultaneously co-exist in a baptized person: the righteousness of God and mortal sin. For Vermigli, however, baptism is simply a covenantal sign similar to the way circumcision functioned for Israel.¹¹⁵⁴ The only way to appropriate the remission of sin is by means of faith.

Concerning the relationship of faith and baptism in Newman’s *Lectures*, we noted the extraordinarily creative way in which he distinguished the “internal” from the “external” instruments of justification.¹¹⁵⁵ In this formulation, Newman wins points for his novelty, but it appears that this position is largely motivated by his *via media* project, that is, his desire to maintain subscription to the Book of Common Prayer’s eleventh Article which asserted that “we are justified by *Faith only*,” while also retaining his commitment to the efficacious and necessary nature of baptismal regeneration.¹¹⁵⁶ It is noteworthy that the Catholic Newman does not articulate this particular understanding of faith and baptism outside of his *Lectures*.¹¹⁵⁷

Vermigli illustrates the central importance of faith alone to Reformed Protestantism, a position that he enthusiastically champions. His conviction is born out of the belief that

¹¹⁵² JD, Annex, 2.A.

¹¹⁵³ CCC, §1427.

¹¹⁵⁴ Vermigli, *Romanos*, 1251 [158].

¹¹⁵⁵ Newman, *Jfc.*, 226 [259].

¹¹⁵⁶ Ibid.

¹¹⁵⁷ The basic idea is also found in article two, *Justification by Faith Only*, of Tract 90.

one's good works have no role whatsoever in *causing* justification.¹¹⁵⁸ However, adamant as he is, Vermigli also insists that good works must necessarily attend and vindicate one's justification. As noted, this emphasis has led some interpreters to label Martyr a "*Reformkatholic*." But this reading fails to appreciate the way Reformed theology seeks to hold sanctification in dynamic tension with justification. The *Reformkatholic* charge is akin to Steven Ozment's suggestion that Calvin's emphasis upon good works (in the context of his social ethics) had the effect of "re-catholicizing" Protestant theology on the doctrine of justification by faith.¹¹⁵⁹

It should be pointed out that contemporary Catholicism, including the Annex to the *JD*, has occasionally expressed a willingness to use the *sola fide* formula with respect to this particular concern, that is, the fact that God is to be relied upon for salvation over oneself.¹¹⁶⁰ But this should not be understood as fully equivalent to the position for which Vermigli and his fellow Reformers contended. With Trent, modern Catholicism is keen to uphold the need for *fides formata caritate* in a sacramental framework beginning with baptism. Hence, the Catholic *Catechism* asserts: "The grace of the Holy Spirit confers upon us the righteousness of God. Uniting us by faith and Baptism to the Passion and

¹¹⁵⁸ Vermigli, *Romanos*, 1321 [227]. In his words, "And when we say that one is justified by faith alone we obviously say nothing else than that one is justified only by the mercy of God and by the merit of Christ, which we cannot grasp by any other instrument than faith alone."

¹¹⁵⁹ Steven E. Ozment, *The Age of Reform 1250—1550: An Intellectual and Religious History of Late Medieval and Reformation Europe* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1980), 374.

¹¹⁶⁰ This is true in Catholic biblical studies and theology alike. Joseph A. Fitzmyer, for instance, argues in his exegesis of Romans 3:28 that "in this context Paul means [to teach justification] 'by faith alone.'" Fitzmyer also provides support for *sola fide* from patristic and medieval interpreters. *Romans* (New York: Doubleday, 1993), 360-363. Then in Pope Benedict's sermon on justification in Saint Peter's Square on November 19, 2008 he said, "Being just simply means being with Christ and in Christ. And this suffices. Further observances are no longer necessary. For this reason Luther's phrase: 'faith alone' is true, if it is not opposed to faith in charity in love." Pope Benedict XVI, *Saint Paul*. (San Francisco: Ignatius Press), 82. A week later, on November 26 in the Paul VI Audience Hall, the pontiff continued this emphasis: "Following Saint Paul, we have seen that man is unable to 'justify' himself with his own actions, but can only truly become 'just' before God because God confers his 'justice' upon him, uniting him to Christ his Son. And man obtains this union through faith. In this sense, Saint Paul tells us: not our deeds, but rather faith renders us 'just'" (84). Finally, there is the Annex (2.C.) to the Joint Declaration on the Doctrine of Justification between the Lutheran World Federation and The Roman Catholic Church, which states that "Justification takes place 'by grace alone' ..., by faith alone; the person is justified 'apart from works.'" (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), 45.

Resurrection of Christ, the Spirit makes us sharers in his life.”¹¹⁶¹ For Rome, therefore, faith is “alone” over against relying upon one’s human resources, but it is nevertheless always embedded in charity in the context of the sacramental life.

Part of the controversy between Catholics and Protestants on the subject of *sola fide* has grown out of the different understanding of the word “faith.” The Tridentine fathers, employing the term in keeping with the medieval scholastic sense of giving mental assent, insisted that this faith is “‘the beginning of human salvation,’ the foundation and root of all justification, ‘without which it is impossible to please God.’”¹¹⁶² This faith, although necessary for justification, must be augmented by the infusion of charity by the Holy Spirit. “For faith, unless hope and charity be added to it, neither unites one perfectly with Christ, nor makes one a living member of his body.”¹¹⁶³ Hence, to be complete, faith must be a *fides formata caritate*.

For Reformers such as Vermigli, on the other hand, the essence of faith is more than mental assent.¹¹⁶⁴ Vermigli understands faith as that which actively “takes hold and receives” the promise of forgiveness.¹¹⁶⁵ As we have noted, he sharply distinguishes this “most sure and certain” faith¹¹⁶⁶ from a “dead faith,”¹¹⁶⁷ “historical faith”¹¹⁶⁸ “human faith”¹¹⁶⁹ “temporary faith,”¹¹⁷⁰ and “naked” faith.¹¹⁷¹ Such faith, argues Vermigli, is “never alone but always draws along with it various motions of the mind,” particularly “confidence, hope, and

¹¹⁶¹ CCC, §2017.

¹¹⁶² *Decree on Justification*, ch. 8.

¹¹⁶³ *Ibid.*, ch. 7.

¹¹⁶⁴ It was in his *Romans* commentary where Vermigli started to feature faith as *fiducia* (trust). Vermigli, *Romans*, 1183 [89]. In this development, Martyr did not jettison *assensus*, but simply broadened his definition to include the volitional nature of justifying faith. *Ibid.*, 1188 [94].

¹¹⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, 1262 [170]: “apprehendimus promissiones Dei.”

¹¹⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, 1183 [89].

¹¹⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, 1187 [93].

¹¹⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, 1285-86 [192].

¹¹⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, 1271 [179].

¹¹⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, 1188 [93].

¹¹⁷¹ *Ibid.*, 1266 [174].

similar affections.”¹¹⁷² We can only imagine how the Tridentine fathers might have responded differently to Protestantism had they grasped this emphasis in the Reformers’ teaching. Thankfully, developments in Catholic thought since Trent have broadened the Catholic understanding of faith to include the possibility that faith might include the giving of one’s whole self to God, mind and volition.¹¹⁷³

With respect to the development of a faith formed by love, or in Newman’s terms “actual righteousness,” it is interesting to note that Vermigli includes the category of *habitus* in his doctrine of justification whereas Newman strictly excludes it.¹¹⁷⁴ In this connection, Vermigli more closely resembles the language of the Catholic position, insisting upon the development of *iustitia inhaerente* which leads to further acts of piety.¹¹⁷⁵ Does this position imply for Vermigli a *partim-partim* view of justification? The answer is “no” concerning the basis or formal cause of justification; likewise, it is “no” in regard to the accumulation of merit *coram deo*, which Martyr categorically disavows.¹¹⁷⁶ But the answer is “yes” when justification is broadly conceived, as Martyr insists that the tangible manifestation of righteousness among those who are justified is *not* accessed by faith alone, but rather is produced by spiritual discipline.¹¹⁷⁷

Despite their difference over the existence of *habitus*, Vermigli and Newman both stress the necessity of personal holiness, holding forensic and actual righteousness together. As the apprehension of righteousness grows, so does one’s capacity to perform good works, which are implicated in the final judgment as necessary constituents of faith. Such works are

¹¹⁷² Ibid., 1183 [89]: “id est, ut nunquam sit nuda, sed trahat secum semper multos ac varios animi motus.”

¹¹⁷³ *Dei Verbum* 5 describes faith as one “by which man entrusts his whole self freely to God offering ‘the full submission of intellect and will to God who reveals’ [Vatican I] and freely assenting to the truth revealed by Him.”

¹¹⁷⁴ Instead, Newman prefers to speak of the personal inhabitation of the Spirit as the agent of actual righteousness (i.e. good works).

¹¹⁷⁵ Vermigli quotes Augustine with approval with regard to “the righteousness that adheres in us” (Augustinum sensisse de iustitia inhaerente). *Romanos*, 1320 [226]; CCC, §2000.

¹¹⁷⁶ Vermigli, *Romanos*, 1289 [195].

¹¹⁷⁷ Ibid., 1318 [224]: “[W]e grant that Christ requires more of us than faith, for who doubts that he wants those who are justified to live uprightly and to practice virtue of all kinds.”

accepted and rewarded by God as a requirement of final justification, a conviction that Newman and Vermigli share with twenty-first century Catholic teaching on the subject.¹¹⁷⁸

F. Assurance of Faith

Another difference between the Catholic and Protestant positions concerns assurance of faith. Apart from the possibility of receiving insight through special revelation, the council fathers deny that one can know that he will persevere to the end.¹¹⁷⁹ It is only with the special help of God that one can indeed persevere,¹¹⁸⁰ although it is always with the possibility of falling away from grace.¹¹⁸¹ This notion is reiterated in the *Catechism of the Catholic Church*:

Mortal sin destroys charity in the heart of man by a grave violation of God's law; it turns man away from God, who is his ultimate end and his beatitude, by preferring an inferior good to him.¹¹⁸²

In contrast to the Catholic position, Peter Martyr argued that one who is justified will most assuredly persevere to the end.

In general, it may be stated that faith cannot be completely extinguished because serious sins are committed by the justified and those destined to salvation. In such cases, faith is lulled to sleep and lies hidden and does not burst forth into action unless awakened again by the Holy Spirit. In such fallen ones, the seed of God remains, although for a time it produces no fruit.¹¹⁸³

¹¹⁷⁸ According to Vermigli, the future “not yet” dimension of justification requires believers to pursue a greater apprehension of love. *Romanos*, 1305-1307 [210-112]. Quoting Augustine, Martyr asserts that by producing virtuous works justified ones fulfill the law by the grace of the Gospel. *Ibid.*, 1239 [146]. Such works are required by the final judgment, *Ibid.*, 1228-1229 [135]; CCC, §1821, §2006, §2024.

¹¹⁷⁹ *Decree on Justification*, Ch. 13; canon 15

¹¹⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, Canon 22.

¹¹⁸¹ *Ibid.*, Canon 23.

¹¹⁸² CCC, §1855. For Newman there was also no perseverance. Just as possessing the Spirit amounts to justification, losing the Spirit means that one has jeopardized justification. *Jfc.*, 151 [168].

¹¹⁸³ Vermigli, *Romanos*, 1278 [186].

In the “Assurance of Salvation” section of the *JD*, which A.N.S. Lane describes as “fairly bland,”¹¹⁸⁴ both sides affirm that the faithful can “rely on the mercy and promises of God” in spite of their weaknesses.¹¹⁸⁵ In §36, the Catholic position conveys what initially sounds like a robust statement on assurance, sharing the “concern of the Reformers to ground faith in the objective reality of Christ’s promise, to look away from one’s own experience, and to trust in Christ’s forgiving word alone.”¹¹⁸⁶ But this is quickly counterbalanced with the reminder: “Every person, however, may be concerned about his salvation when he looks upon his own weaknesses and shortcomings.”¹¹⁸⁷ Thus, the substance of Trent’s position has not changed significantly, although it is now conveyed in a way that recognizes validity in the Protestant claim to assurance of God’s saving intention.¹¹⁸⁸

G. The Role of Merit

Related to this question is the matter of whether justification admits a meritorious increase. According to Newman, meritorious works can indeed increase as one’s apprehension of justification itself (by a greater manifestation of the Spirit) increases.¹¹⁸⁹ On this subject, it is interesting to see that in the First Edition of his *Lectures*, Newman affirmed what he considered to be the perfection of adherent righteousness among those who are justified; but he retracted his statement in his Third Edition:

[The justified are “perfect”] in relation to the past, as being a simple reversal of the state of guilt, and a bringing into God’s favour; but as God’s favour towards us will grow as we become more holy, so as we become more holy, we may receive a higher justification. The words in the text are inconsistent with an increase of justification, which Catholics hold.¹¹⁹⁰

¹¹⁸⁴ Lane, *Justification by Faith*, 215.

¹¹⁸⁵ *JD*, §34.

¹¹⁸⁶ *JD*, §36.

¹¹⁸⁷ *Ibid.*

¹¹⁸⁸ Thus, the closing sentence of the Catholic position says, “Recognizing [the justified person’s] own failures, however, the believer may yet be certain that God intends his salvation,” *Ibid.*

¹¹⁸⁹ Newman, *Jfc.*, 151-152 [168-169]. Because justification and sanctification are united in Newman’s doctrine and grow together in proportion to God’s manifest presence, the believer’s meritorious works likewise grow.

¹¹⁹⁰ *Ibid.*, 73.

For Trent justification is on account of the merits of Christ being poured into the hearts of those who are justified.¹¹⁹¹ In this case, as with Newman's position, the *process* of justification entails an ongoing appropriation of divine righteousness by which one is increasingly justified. As the Catholic *Catechism* puts it, "Moved by the Holy Spirit, we can merit for ourselves and for others all the graces needed to attain eternal life...."¹¹⁹²

For Vermigli, the notion that one can merit for himself divine favor is unacceptable. He asserts, "Therefore, we must take away all merit, not only in those who are not yet justified, but also in those who have been justified."¹¹⁹³ It is only by the merit of Christ (*solus Christi merito*) that one is justified.¹¹⁹⁴ In this way, justification admits no increase with regard to the ground of our acceptance.¹¹⁹⁵ However, although Martyr rejects the category of human merit, he affirms that God accepts¹¹⁹⁶ and rewards¹¹⁹⁷ Christian works as a necessary constituent of final justification.¹¹⁹⁸ In this sense, one's works possess real value and prevail *coram deo*.¹¹⁹⁹

The *JD*, in keeping with Trent, asserts that initial justification is unmerited.¹²⁰⁰ Having been justified, the faithful are then expected to produce virtuous fruit and "bring forth the works of love."¹²⁰¹ The Catholic statement readily affirms that such works are made possible "by grace and the working of the Holy Spirit,"¹²⁰² and that its usage of the word "meritorious" intends to account for the fact that one's works are rewarded in heaven. In other words, the intention behind meritorious works is a desire "to emphasize the responsibility of persons for

¹¹⁹¹ *Decree on Justification*, Ch. 7.

¹¹⁹² *CCC*, §2027.

¹¹⁹³ Vermigli, *Romanos*, 1289 [195].

¹¹⁹⁴ *Ibid.*, 1321 [227].

¹¹⁹⁵ *Ibid.*, 1274 [182].

¹¹⁹⁶ *Ibid.*, 1227-1228 [134]; cf. *Corinthios Commentarii*, 19 [147].

¹¹⁹⁷ *Ibid.*, 1288 [195].

¹¹⁹⁸ This is so because such imperfect works are completed by Christ's imputed righteousness.

¹¹⁹⁹ In this sense (and this sense only), we concluded that Vermigli can be said to endorse justification by works.

¹²⁰⁰ *JD*, §25, 27.

¹²⁰¹ *JD*, §37.

¹²⁰² *JD* §38.

the action, not to contest the character of those works as gifts, or far less to deny that justification always remains the unmerited gift of grace.”¹²⁰³ While Reformed Protestants would prefer to describe virtuous works as the “fruit” of justification,¹²⁰⁴ and not our own “merits,” it is in fundamental agreement with the Augustinian logic of the Catholic position—that our merits are in fact God’s gifts.

H. Conclusion

In breaking with their medieval past at significant points, the magisterial Reformers forged a specific understanding of the doctrine of justification. Their differentiation between justification and sanctification, stress upon a forensic declaration that changes one’s relationship to God, and delimiting of its formal cause to an imputed form of righteousness, allowed clear blue water to flow between the Roman Catholic and Reformed Protestant positions—or at least that seemed to be the case. However, we have noted, despite these differences, Roman Catholics and Reformed Protestants share more common ground than is ordinarily recognized. We find, for example, a common commitment to union with Christ by the Holy Spirit, a union that imparts the remission of sins *and* internal renewal by divine initiative. This righteousness grows in an internal habit of grace, producing virtue as it reaches toward holiness. Such works are a necessary part of justification which pleases God and receives his favor in the form of rewards.

A major implication of such common ground is recognition of the inadequacy of popular conceptions that contrast the Roman Catholic and Reformed Protestant doctrines as diametrically opposed to one another. As we have observed, both traditions consider justification to entail both forgiveness of sins *and* making righteousness—God’s work *pro nobis* and *in nobis*—albeit in different ways. It is true that Reformed Protestants continue to differentiate justifying righteousness from sanctifying righteousness, but since the Christian possesses a union with Christ by the Spirit, the forensic and actual forms of righteousness are inseparably connected, and, if one follows Vermigli, may in some sense be held together beneath the banner of “justification” (with the requisite qualifications).¹²⁰⁵

¹²⁰³ *JD* §38. Cf. Annex 2.E, “Any reward is a reward of grace, on which we have no claim.”

¹²⁰⁴ So the Lutheran position in *JD* §39.

¹²⁰⁵ Robert Ives sheds light on this duality (without respect to Vermigli) when he raises the helpful question: “Is justification the forensic action of being made right with God or is the whole

Despite this convergence, however, some irreconcilable differences remain. Most fundamental is the question of justification's formal cause, whether divine forgiveness is ultimately based upon an internal work of the Spirit or the forensic imputation of Christ's righteousness. There is also the basic difference of how Christ's righteousness is appropriated—by means of faith alone through the sacrament of baptism. And, there is the difference over perseverance of faith, whether Christians are eternally secure in their justification.

In light of this analysis, readers will hopefully have recognized the significant agreement that Catholics and Protestants share on justification. We make no pretense to having resolved the range of differences between Catholics and Protestants; much less have we eliminated the *crux theologorum* associated with interpreting the biblical teaching of Paul and James on the subject. But we have hopefully offered insight into places where lines of similarity and difference fall so that the challenge is less burdensome. Those who wish to take this research further will perhaps want to examine how Peter Martyr's sacramental theology sheds light on the contemporary ecumenical discussion. Such research promises to illumine the role of ecclesiology for the conversation.¹²⁰⁶ Our study also raises interesting questions concerning the way justification may influence one's conversion across the Catholic/Protestant divide.¹²⁰⁷ In the meantime, Catholics and Protestants will hopefully

salvation process involved?" The answer, according to a *duplex iustitia* understanding, is "yes." Both activities belong to justification. The challenge, as we have observed, is to precisely define how these movements function in relation to one another and to other elements of soteriology. "An Early Effort toward Protestant-Catholic Conciliation: The Doctrine of Double Justification in the Sixteenth Century." *Gordon Review* 11 (1968-70): 99-110 (99).

¹²⁰⁶ *The Oxford Treatise and Disputation on the Eucharist, 1549*. Translated and Edited by Joseph C. McLelland. *The Peter Martyr Library* 7. (Kirksville, MO: Truman State University Press, 2000); Joseph C. McLelland, *The Visible Words of God: An Exposition of the Sacramental Theology of Peter Martyr Vermigli, A.D. 1500-1562*. (Edinburgh: Oliver & Boyd), 1957; Donald Fuller, "Sacrifice and Sacrament: Another Eucharistic Contribution from Peter Martyr Vermigli." In *Peter Martyr Vermigli and the European Reformations: Semper Reformanda*, edited by Frank A. James, III. (Leiden: Brill, 2004), 215-237; Jason Zuidema, *Peter Martyr Vermigli (1499-1562) and the Outward Instruments of Divine Grace*. (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht), 2008.

¹²⁰⁷ Because the dynamics of conversion are complex, involving a multifaceted process of change with personal, cultural, social, and religious implications, it would be fascinating to combine historical and theological reflection with insights from psychology, sociology, anthropology, history, and missiology to understand how such factors motivate religious migration. For perspective on how these disciplines can work together, see Lewis R. Rambo, *Understanding Religious Conversion*. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1993).

recognize that their differences on justification are not as irreconcilable as they may at first appear, even though fundamental differences remain.

Bibliography

- Allison, C. FitzSimons. *The Rise of Moralism: The Proclamation of the Gospel from Hooker to Baxter*. New York: Seabury Press, 1966.
- Althaus, Paul. *The Theology of Martin Luther*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1966.
- Altholz, Josef Lewis. "The Mind and art of Victorian Orthodoxy: Anglican Responses to 'Essays and Reviews,' 1860-1864." *Church History* 51 (1982): 186-197.
- Anderson, George H., T. Austin Murphy, and Joseph A. Burgess eds. *Justification by Faith: Lutherans and Catholics in Dialogue VII*. Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1985.
- Anderson, Marvin W. "Biblical Humanism and Roman Catholic Reform 1444-1563: A Study of Renaissance Philology and New Testament Criticism from Laurentius Valla to Pietro Martyre Vermigli." PhD diss., University of Aberdeen, 1964.
- _____. "Peter Martyr on Romans." *Scottish Journal of Theology* 26 (1973): 401-420.
- _____. "Rhetoric and Reality: Peter Martyr and the English Reformation." *Sixteenth Century Journal* 19, no. 3 (1988): 451-469.
- _____. *Peter Martyr, a Reformer in Exile (1542-1562): A Chronology of Biblical Writings in England & Europe*. Nieuwkoop: De Graaf, 1975.
- _____. "Word and Spirit in Exile (1542-1562): The Biblical Writings of Peter Martyr Vermigli." *Journal of Ecumenical Studies* 21 (1970): 193-201.
- Armstrong, Brian G. *Calvinism and the Amyraut Heresy: Protestant Scholasticism and Humanism in Seventeenth-Century France*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1969.
- Aristotle, *Physics* 2.3. trans. Philip H. Wicksteed and Francis M. Cornford, Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1968—.
- Ashton, J. W. "Peter Martyr on the Function and Character of Literature." *Philological Quarterly* 18 (1939): 311-314.
- Augustine. "The Spirit and the Letter." *Augustine: Later Works*, edited by John Burnaby, 26:45. London: SCM Press, 1955.
- Balleine, G. R. *A History of Evangelical Party in the Church of England*. London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1908.
- Balserak, Jon. "1 Corinthians Commentary: Exegetical Tradition." In *A Companion to Peter Martyr Vermigli*, edited by W. J. Torrance Kirby, Emidio Campi, and Frank A. James, III, 459-465. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- Baschera, Luca. "Aristotle and Scholasticism." In *A Companion to Peter Martyr Vermigli*, edited by W. J. Torrance Kirby, Emidio Campi, and Frank A. James, III, 133-160. Leiden: Brill, 2009.

- Baumann, Michael. "Josias Simler's Hagiography." In *A Companion to Peter Martyr Vermigli*, edited by W. J. Torrance Kirby, Emidio Campi, and Frank A. James, III, 459-465. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- _____. "Albert Pighius." In *Oxford Encyclopedia of the Reformation*, edited by Hans Hillerbrand, Vol. 3. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1984.
- Bäumer, Remigius. "Albert Pigge." In *Katholische Theologen der Reformationszeit*, edited by Erwin Iserloh, 98-106. Münster: Aschendorff, 1984.
- Baumgartner, Charles. *La grâce du Christ*. Mystère Chrétien: Théologie Dogmatique 10. Tournai: Desclée & Co., 1963.
- Bebbington, D. W. *Evangelicalism in Modern Britain: A History from the 1730s to the 1980s*. London: Unwin Hyman, 1989.
- Bellarmino, Roberto. "Disputationum de controversiis Christianae fidei tomus tertius." In *Disputationum Roberti Bellarmini Politiani Societatis Iesu, de controversiis Christianae fidei, adversus huius temporis haereticos*, 1268-1269. Ingolstadt: Ex officina typographica Davidis Sartorii, 1593.
- Benrath, Karl. *Bernardino Ochino, of Siena: A Contribution Towards the History of the Reformation*. Translated by Helen Zimmern. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers, 1877.
- Beveridge, William. *Private thoughts upon religion digested into twelve articles, with practical resolutions form'd thereupon*. London: R. Smith, 1709.
- Beza, Theodore. *Beza's "Icones": Contemporary Portraits of Reformers of Religion and Letters*. Translated by Charles Greig McCrie. London: The Religious Tract Society, 1909.
- _____. *Icones, id est Verae imagines virorum doctrina simul et pietate illustrium*. Geneva: C. Froschauer, 1580.
- Biemer, Günter. *Newman on Tradition*. Translated by Kevin Smyth. New York: Herder and Herder, 1967.
- Billings, Todd. *Calvin, Participation, and the Gift: The Activity of Believers in Union with Christ, Changing Paradigms in Historical Theology*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2007.
- Blehl, Vincent Ferrer. "Early Criticism of the Apologia." In *Newman's Apologia: A Classic Reconsidered*, edited by Vincent Ferrer Blehl. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1964.
- _____. *John Henry Newman: A Bibliographical Catalogue of His Writings*. Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1978.
- _____. *Pilgrim Journey: John Henry Newman 1801-1845*. London: Burns & Oates, 2001.
- Blehl, Vincent Ferrer, Francis X. Connolly, and Fordham University. Centre of Newman Studies. *Newman's Apologia a Classic Reconsidered*. 1st ed. New York: Harcourt, 1964.

- Blocher, Henri A. "The Lutheran-Catholic Declaration on Justification" in *Justification in Perspective: Historical Developments and Contemporary Challenges*. Ed. Bruce L McCormack. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2006.
- Boekraad, Adrian J. *The Personal Conquest of Truth According to J. H. Newman*. Louvain: Nauwelaerts, 1955.
- Borsch, Frederick H. "Yes Shall Be Holy: Reflections on the Spirituality of the Early Years of the Oxford Movement." *Anglican Theological Review* 66 (Oct., 1984): 356.
- Boughton, Lynne Courter. "Supralapsarianism and the Role of Metaphysics in Sixteenth-century Reformed Theology," *The Westminster Theological Journal*, no. 48 (1986): 63-96.
- Bouwsma, William J. *Venice and the Defense of Republican Liberty*. Los Angeles: University of California, 1984.
- Bouyer, Louis. *Newman: His Life and Spirituality*. San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 2011.
- _____. *Newman: sa vie, sa spiritualité*. Paris,: Éditions du Cerf, 1952.
- Bowd, Stephen D. *Reform before the Reformation: Vincenzo Querini and the Religious Renaissance in Italy*. Studies in Medieval and Reformation Thought, 87. Leiden: Brill, 2002.
- Bozza, Tommaso. *Nuovi studi sulla Riforma in Italia, I: Il Beneficio di Cristo*. Uomini e dottrine. Rome: Edizioni di storia e letteratura, 1976.
- Bremond, Henri. *Newman: Essai de biographie psychologique*. Paris: Librairie Bloud & Cie, 1906.
- _____. *The Mystery of Newman*. Translated by H.C. Corrance. London: Williams & Norgate, 1907.
- Brilioth, Yngve. *The Anglican Revival: Studies in the Oxford Movement*. London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1925.
- _____. *Three Lectures on Evangelicalism and the Oxford Movement: Together with a Lecture on the Theological Aspect of the Oxford Movement and a Sermon Preached in Fairford Church on 11 July 1933*. London: Oxford University Press, 1934.
- Brown, David. *Newman: A Man for Our Time*. London: S.P.C.K., 1990.
- Brundin, Abigail, and Matthew Treherne, eds. *Forms of Faith in Sixteenth-century Italy*. Aldershot, UK: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2009.
- Bryant, William Douglas. "Bishop George Bull's Doctrine of Justification." Ph.D. Dissertation, The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2011.
- Bucer, Martin. *Acta colloquii in commitiis Imperii Ratisponae habiti, hoc est articuli de religione conciliati, & non conciliati omnes, ut ab Imperatore ordinibus Imperii ad iudicandum, & deliberandum propositi sunt. Consulta & deliberata de his actis Imperatoris singulorum ordinum Imperii & legati Romani*. Strasbourg: Wendelin Rihel, 1541.
- _____. *Enarrationes perpetua in sacra quatuor Evangelia*. Strasbourg: Georgium Vricherum Andlanum, 1530.

- _____. *Metaphrasis et enarratio in epist. d. Pauli apostoli ad Romanos, in quibus singulatim apostoli omnia, cum argumenta, tum sententiae & verba, ad auctoritatem divinae scripturae, fidemque ecclesiae Catholicae tam priscae quàm praesentis, religiosè ac paulò fusius excutiuntur.* Basel: Apud Petrum Pernam, 1562.
- _____. *Sacrorum psalmorum libri quinque.* Strasbourg: Georgium Vlricherum Andlanum, 1529.
- Bull, George. *Harmonia apostolica: or, Two dissertations : in the former of which the doctrine of St. James on justification by works is explained and defended: in the latter, the agreement of St. Paul with St. James is clearly shown* Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology. Oxford: J. H. Parker, 1842.
- Burke, Peter. *Culture and Society in Renaissance Italy, 1420-1540.* Studies in Cultural History. London: Batsford, 1972.
- Büsser, Fritz. "Vermigli in Zurich." In *Peter Martyr Vermigli: Humanism, Republicanism, Reformation*, edited by Emidio Campi, Frank A. James, III, and Peter Opitz, 203-212. Geneva: Librairie Droz, 2002.
- Butler, Joseph. *The analogy of religion, natural and revealed, to the constitution and course of nature.* London: John and Paul Knapton, 1736.
- Calkin, Arthur Burton. "John Henry Newman on Conscience and the Magisterium." *Downside Review* 87 (1969): 358-69.
- Calvin, Jean. *De aeterna Dei praedestinatione, qua in salutem alios ex hominibus elegit, alios suo exitio reliquit; item de providentia qua res humanas gubernat, Consensus pastorum Genevensis ecclesiae, a Io. Calvino expositus.* Geneva: Jean Crispin, 1552.
- _____. *Defensio sanae et orthodoxae doctrinae de servitute et liberatione humani arbitrii adversus calumnias Alberti Pighii Campensis* Geneva: Jean Crispin, 1543.
- _____. *Defensio sanae et orthodoxae doctrinae de servitute et liberatione humani arbitrii adversus calumnias Alberti Pighii Campensis.* Ioannis Calvinii Noviodunensis opera omnia: in novem tomos digesta. Amsterdam: Apud viduam Ioannis Iacobi Schipperii, 1671.
- _____. *Ioannis Calvinii, magni theologi, Institutionum Christianae religionis libri quatuor.* Ioannis Calvinii Noviodunensis opera omnia, in novem tomos digesta. Amsterdam: Apud viduam Ioannis Iacobi Schipperii, 1671.
- _____. *Ioannis Calvinii opera quae supersunt omnia.* Edited by Guilielmus Baum, Eduardus Cunitz, and Eduardus Reuss. Vol. 11. Corpus Reformatorum 39. Brunsviga: C.A. Schwetschke, 1873.
- Calvin, John. *Institutes of the Christian Religion.* Edited by John T. McNeill. Translated by Ford Lewis Battles. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1960.
- _____. *Letters of John Calvin.* Translated and Edited by Jules Bonnet. Vol. 1. 4 vols. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication, 1858.
- _____. *Selected Works of John Calvin: Tracts and Letters.* Edited by Henry Beveridge and Jules Bonnet. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1983.

- _____. *The Bondage and Liberation of the Will: A Defence of the Orthodox Doctrine of Human Choice against Pighius*. Edited by A. N. S. Lane. Translated by G. I. Davies. Texts and Studies in Reformation and Post-reformation Thought 2. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 1996.
- Campi, Emidio. "Genesis Commentary: Interpreting Creation." In *A Companion to Peter Martyr Vermigli*, edited by W. J. Torrance Kirby, Emidio Campi, and Frank A. James, III, 459-465. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- Campi, Emidio, Frank A. James, III, and Peter Opitz, eds. *Peter Martyr Vermigli: Humanism, Republicanism, Reformation*. Geneva: Librairie Droz, 2002.
- Cantimori, Delio. *Eretici italiani del Cinquecento: Ricerche storiche*. Biblioteca storica Sansoni. Florence: G.C. Sansoni, 1939.
- _____. *Prospettive di storia ereticale italiana del Cinquecento*. Bari: Editori Laterza, 1960.
- Caponetto, Salvatore. *The Protestant Reformation in Sixteenth-century Italy*. Translated by Anne Tedeschi and John A. Tedeschi. Kirksville, MO: Thomas Jefferson University Press, 1999.
- Cargnoni, Costanzo, Antonio Gentili, Mauro Regazzoni, and Pietro Zovatto. *Storia della spiritualità italiana*. Edited by Pietro Zovatto. Rome: Città Nuova Editrice, 2002.
- Catechism of the Catholic Church*, Ed. 2, Citta del vaticano: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 1997.
- Carter, Lindberg. *The European Reformations*, 2nd Edition. Malden: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010.
- Chadwick, Henry. "The Lectures on Justification." In *Newman After a Hundred Years*, edited by Ian Ker. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990.
- Chadwick, Owen. *From Bossuet to Newman*. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.
- _____. *Newman*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1983.
- _____. *The Mind of the Oxford Movement*. London: A. & C. Black, 1960.
- _____. *The Spirit of the Oxford Movement: Tractarian Essays*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.
- _____. *The Victorian Church: An Ecclesiastical History of England*, 2 vols. New York: Oxford University Press, 1966, 1970.
- Chisnall, Peter M. *John Henry Cardinal Newman: A Man of Courage, Conflict and Conviction*. London: St Pauls Publishing, 2001.
- Church, Frederic Corss. *The Italian Reformers, 1534-1564*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1932. Reprint, 1974.
- Church of England. "Articles of Religion, XI." In *The Book of Common Prayer, and Administration of the Sacraments, and Other Rites and Ceremonies of the Church*. London: Reeves, 1801.
- Church, Richard William. *The Oxford Movement: Twelve Years, 1833-1845*. 3rd. ed. London: Macmillan, 1892.

- Collett, Barry. *Italian Benedictine Scholars and the Reformation: The Congregation of Santa Giustina of Padua*. Oxford Historical Monographs. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985.
- Contarini, Gasparo. "Cardinal Gasparao Contarini, Bishop of Belluno, *Gegenreformatorsche Shriften* (1530c.-1542)," edited by Friedrich Hünermann. *Corpus Catholicorum* 7. Münster in Westfalen, 1923.
- Corda, Salvatore. *Veritas Sacramenti: A Study in Vermigli's Doctrine of the Lord's Supper*. Zürcher Beiträge zur Reformationsgeschichte Zurich: Theologischer Verlag, 1975.
- Coulson, John. *Newman and the Common Tradition: A Study in the Language of Church and Society*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1970.
- Cox, G. V. *Recollections of Oxford*. London: Macmillan, 1868.
- Crews, Daniel A. *Twilight of the Renaissance: The Life of Juan de Valdés*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2008.
- Cross, Claire. "Oxford and the Tudor State 1509-1558." In *The Collegiate University*, edited by James McConica, Vol. 3, *The History of the University of Oxford*, gen. ed. T. H. Aston, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986.
- Cunliffe-Jones, H. "Newman on Justification." *The Clergy Review* 54 (1969): 17-24.
- Daley, Brian E. "The Church Fathers." In *The Cambridge Companion to John Henry Newman*, edited by Ian Ker and Terrance Merrigan, 29-46. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.
- Dall'Asta, G. "Pietro Martire Vermigli (1499-1562). La sua teologia eucaristica." *La scuola cattolica* 91 (1983): 275-303.
- Davies, C. Martin. "The Doctrine of Justification According to J. H. Newman, Martin Luther and the Council of Trent." M. Phil. thesis University of Leeds, 1970.
- Davies, H. F. "Newman and Thomism." *Newman-Studien* 3 (1957): 157-169.
- Dawson, Christopher. *The Spirit of the Oxford Movement*. London: Sheed & Ward, 1933.
- Dessain, Charles Stephen. "Cardinal Newman and the Eastern Tradition." *Downside Review* 94 (1976).
- _____. "Cardinal Newman and the Doctrine of Uncreated Grace " *The Clergy Review* 47 (1962): 207-229; 269-288.
- _____. *John Henry Newman*. London: Nelson, 1966.
- _____. "The Biblical Basis of Newman's Ecumenical Theology." In *The Rediscovery of Newman: An Oxford symposium*, edited by John Coulson and A. M. Allchin, xxi, 250 p. London: Sheed & Ward, 1967.
- _____. *The Spirituality of John Henry Newman*. Minneapolis: Winston Press, 1980.
- Di Gangi, Mariano. *Peter Martyr Vermigli, 1499-1562: Renaissance Man, Reformation Master*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1993.
- _____. "Pietro Martire Vermigli (1500-1562): An Italian Calvinist." BD thesis, Presbyterian College, Montreal, Canada, 1949.

- Dickens, A. G. *The Counter Reformation*. Library of European Civilization. London: Thames and Hudson, 1968.
- Dickens, Charles. *A Tale of Two Cities* London: James Nisbet & Co., 1902.
- Dionysii, Petavii. "De Trinitate." In *Theologica Dogmata*, edited by F. A. Zacharia. Paris, 1865.
- Dittrich, Franz. *Gasparo Contarini, 1483-1542: Eine Monographie*. Braunsberg: Verlag der Ermländischen Zeitungs und Verlagsdruckerei, 1885.
- Donnelly, John Patrick. *Calvinism and Scholasticism in Vermigli's Doctrine of Man and Grace*. Studies in Medieval and Reformation Thought 18. Leiden: Brill, 1976.
- _____. "Calvinist Thomism." *Viator* 7 (1976): 441-455.
- _____. "Peter Martyr on Fallen Man: A Protestant Scholastic View." PhD diss., University of Wisconsin, Madison, 1971.
- _____. "Peter Martyr Vermigli's Political Ethics." In *Peter Martyr Vermigli: Humanism, Republicanism, Reformation*, edited by Emidio Campi, Frank A. James, III, and Peter Opitz, 59-66. Geneva: Librairie Droz, 2002.
- Dulles, Avery Cardinal. *John Henry Newman*. London: Continuum, 2011.
- _____. "Justification in Contemporary Theology," in *Justification by Faith: Lutherans and Catholics in Dialogue VII*, ed. H. George Anderson et al. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1985.
- _____. "Justification and the Unity of the Church," in *The Gospel of Justification in Christ: Where Does the Church Stand Today?* Edited by Wayne C. Sturm. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006.
- Duncan, G. D. "Public Lectures and Professional Chairs" in *The Collegiate University*, ed. James McConica, Vol. 3, *The History of the University of Oxford*, gen. ed., Trevor Henry Aston. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986.
- Durand, Elie. *Vie de Pierre Martyr Vermigli*. Toulouse: Imprimerie A. Chauvin et Fils, 1868.
- Edgecombe, Rodney Stenning. *Two Poets of the Oxford Movement: John Keble and John Henry Newman*. London: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 1996.
- Eells, Hastings. "The Origin of the Regensburg Book." *The Princeton Theological Review* 26, no. 3 (1928): 355-372.
- Egan, Keith J. "The Spirituality of the Carmelites." In *Christian Spirituality: High Middle Ages and Reformation*, edited by Jill Raitt, Bernard McGinn, and John Meyendorff, 50-62. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1987.
- Elowsky, Joel "Bridging the Gap." In *Theosis: Deification in Christian Theology*, edited by Vladimir Kharlamov. OR: Pickwick, 2011.
- Erasmus Roterodamus, Desiderius. *Inquisitio de Fide: A Colloquy by Desiderius Erasmus Roterodamus, 1524*. Edited by Craig R. Thompson. 2nd ed. Hamden, CT: Archon Books, 1975.
- _____. *Enchiridion militis christiani*. Leiden: Ex Officinâ Ioannis Maire, 1641.
- Faber, G. C. *Oxford Apostles: A Character Study of the Oxford Movement*. London: Faber and Faber, 1933.

- Faber, George Stanley. *The primitive doctrine of justification investigated: relatively to the several definitions of the Church of Rome and the Church of England and a special reference to the opinions of the late Mr. Knox, as published in his Remains*. London: R.B. Seeley and W. Burnside, 1837.
- Fackre, Gabriel. "Affirmations and Admonitions: Lutheran and Reformed," *The Gospel of Justification in Christ: Where Does the Church Stand Today?* Edited by Wayne C. Sturm. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006.
- Feiner, Johann. *Die Erbsündenlehre Albert Pigges: ein Beitrag zur Erforschung der kath. Kontroverstheologie*. Ph.D. thesis, Pontificia Universitas Gregoriana, 1940.
- Fenlon, Dermot. *Heresy and Obedience in Tridentine Italy: Cardinal Pole and the Counter Reformation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1972.
- Fink, David C. "The Doers of the Law Will Be Justified: The Exegetical Origins of Martin Bucer's *Triplex Iustificatio*." *Journal of Theological Studies* 58 (2007), 485-524.
- _____. "Was There a Reformation Doctrine of Justification?" *Harvard Theological Review* 103 (2010), 205-235.
- Firpo, Massimo. "The Italian Reformation and Juan de Valdés." Translated by John A. Tedeschi. *Sixteenth Century Journal* 27 (1996): 353-364.
- Fitzmyer, Joseph. *Romans*. New York: Doubleday, 1993.
- Flanagan, Philip. *Newman, Faith and the Believer*. Westminster, Md.: Newman Bookshop, 1946.
- Foister, Susan. *Cardinal Newman 1801-90: A Centenary Exhibition*. London: National Portrait Gallery Publications, 1990.
- Forcellino, Antonio. *Michelangelo: A Tormented Life*. Translated by Allan Cameron. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press, 2009.
- Foxe, John. *Actes and monuments*. London: John Day, 1563.
- Fuller, Donald. "Sacrifice and Sacrament: Another Eucharistic Contribution from Peter Martyr Vermigli." In *Peter Martyr Vermigli and the European Reformations: Semper Reformanda*, edited by Frank A. James, III, 215-237. Leiden: Brill, 2004.
- Froude, Richard Hurrell. *Remains of the late Reverend Richard Hurrell Froude*. Edited by John Henry Newman and John Keble. 2 vols. London: C. J. G. & F. Rivington, 1838.
- Garcia, Mark A. *Life in Christ: Union with Christ and Twofold Grace in Calvin's Theology*. Studies in Christian History and Thought. Milton Keynes: Paternoster, 2008.
- Gardy, Frédéric. "Les Livres de Pierre Martyr Vermigli conservé à la Bibliothèque de Genève." *Anzeiger für Schweizerische Geschichte* 50 (1919): 1-6.
- Gibbs, Lee W. "Richard Hooker's *Via Media* Doctrine of Justification." *Harvard Theological Review* 74, no. 2 (1981): 211-220.
- Gilbert, Felix. *History: Choice and Commitment*. Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1977.

- Gilley, Sheridan. "Life and Writings." In *The Cambridge Companion to John Henry Newman*, edited by Ian Ker and Terrance Merrigan. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.
- _____. *Newman and His Age*. Westminster: Christian Classics, 1991.
- Gilly, Carlos. "Juan de Valdés: Übersetzer und Bearbeiter von Luthers Schriften in seinem *Diálogo de Doctrina*." *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte* 74 (1983): 257-305.
- Ginzburg, Carlo, and Adriano Prosperi. "Le due redazioni del 'Beneficio di Cristo'." In *Eresia e riforma nell'Italia del Cinquecento: Miscellanea I*, 135-204. Florence: G.C. Sansoni, 1974.
- Gleason, Elisabeth. *Gasparo Contarini: Venice, Rome, and Reform*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993.
- _____. "On the Nature of Sixteenth-century Italian Evangelism: Scholarship, 1953-1978." *Sixteenth Century Journal* 9, no. 3 (1978): 3-25.
- _____. "Sixteenth-century Italian Interpretations of Luther." *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte* 60 (1969): 160-173.
- Gorham, George Cornelius. *Gleanings of a Few Scattered Ears, During the Period of the Reformation in England and of the Times Succeeding A.D. 1533 to A.D. 1589*. London: Bell and Daldy, 1857.
- Gorman, Michael J. *Inhabiting the Cruciform God: Kenosis, Justification, and Theosis in Paul's Narrative Soteriology*. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 2009.
- Greenslade, S. L. "The Faculty of Theology." In *The Collegiate University*, edited by James McConica, Vol. 3, *The History of the University of Oxford, gen. ed. Trevor Henry Aston*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986.
- Gregory, Brad S. *Salvation at Stake: Christian Martyrdom in Early Modern Europe*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1999.
- Grendler, Paul F. "Religious Restlessness in Sixteenth-century Italy." *The Canadian Catholic Historical Association* 33 (1966): 25-38.
- Greschat, Martin. *Martin Bucer: A Reformer and His Times*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2004.
- Guyer, Benjamin. *The Beauty of Holiness: The Caroline Divines and Their Writings*. London: Canterbury Press Norwich, 2012.
- Hamm, Berndt. "What was the Reformation Doctrine of Justification?" in *The Reformation of Faith in the Context of Late Medieval Theology and Piety: Essays by Berndt Hamm*. Ed. Robert J. Bast. Leiden: Brill, 2004.
- Hall, Basil. "The Colloquy Between Catholics and Protestants, 1539-41." *Studies in Church History* 7 (1971): 235-266.
- Harland, Marion. *William Cowper*. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1899.
- Harper, Francis Whaley. *A few observations on the teaching of dr. Pusey and mr. Newman, concerning justification*. Cambr. & c., 1842.

- Harrold, Charles Frederick. *John Henry Newman: An Expository and Critical Study of His Mind, Thought and Art*. London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1945.
- Heurtley, Charles A. *Justification: eight sermons preached before the University of Oxford in the year 1845* [S.I.]: John Henry Parker, 1846.
- Holloway, John. *The Victorian Sage: Studies in Argument*. London: Macmillan, 1953.
- Holtzen, Thomas L. "Newman's 'Via Media' Theology of Justification " *Newman Studies Journal* 4, no. 2 (2007): 64-74.
- _____. "Union with God and the Holy Spirit: A New Paradigm of Justification." Ph.D. Diss., Marquette University, 2002.
- Hooker, Richard. *The Works of the Learned and Judicious Divine Mr. Richard Hooker with an Account of His Life and Death by Isaac Walton, edited by the Rev. John Keble*. Vol. II. New York: D. Appleton & Company, 1844.
- _____. *Tractates and Sermons*. Edited by W. Speed Hill, Laetitia Yeandle, and Egil Grislis. 7 vols. The Folger Library Edition of the Works of Richard Hooker 5. Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1990.
- Huelin, Gordon. "Peter Martyr and the English Reformation." PhD diss., University of London, 1954.
- Hugelshofer, Walter. "Zum Porträt des Petrus Martyr Vermiglius." *Zwingliana* 3 (1930): 127-129.
- Hughes, Philip Edgcumbe, ed. *Faith and Works: Cranmer and Hooker on Justification*. Wilton, CT: Morehouse-Barlow Co., 1982.
- Huizinga, Johan. *Erasmus and the Age of Reformation*. New York: Harper and Row, 1957.
- Hutton, Richard Holt. *Cardinal Newman*. 2nd ed. London: Methuen, 1891.
- Imbart de La Tour, Pierre. *Les Origines de la Réforme: L'Évangélisme*. Vol. 3. Paris: Hachette, 1914.
- Ives, Robert. "An Early Effort toward Protestant-Catholic Conciliation: The Doctrine of Double Justification in the Sixteenth Century." *Gordon Review* 11 (1968-70): 99-110.
- James, Frank A., III. "A Late Medieval Parallel in Reformation Thought: Gemina Praedestinatio in Gregory of Rimini and Peter Martyr Vermigli." In *Via Augustini: Augustine in the Later Middle Ages, Renaissance, and Reformation; Essays in Honor of Damasus Trapp*, edited by Frank A. James, III and Heiko A. Oberman, 157-188. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1991.
- _____. "De Iustificazione: The Evolution of Peter Martyr Vermigli's Doctrine of Justification." PhD diss., Westminster Theological Seminary, 2000.
- _____. "Juan de Valdés Before and After Peter Martyr Vermigli: The Reception of Gemina Praedestinatio in Valdés Later Thought." *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte* 83 (1992): 180-208.
- _____. "Neglected Sources of the Reformed Doctrine of Predestination: Ulrich Zwingli and Peter Martyr Vermigli." *Modern Reformation* 7 (1998): 18-22.

- _____. "Nunc Peregrinus Oberrat: Peter Martyr in Context." In *Peter Martyr Vermigli and the European Reformations: Semper Reformanda*, edited by Frank A. James, III, xiii-xxv. Leiden: Brill, 2004.
- _____. "Peter Martyr in Bucer's Strasbourg: The Early Formulations of His Doctrine of Justification." *Perichoresis* 1, no. 2 (2003): 5-33.
- _____. "Peter Martyr Vermigli: At the Crossroads of Late Medieval Scholasticism, Christian Humanism, and Resurgent Augustinianism." In *Protestant Scholasticism: Essays in Reassessment*, edited by Carl R. Trueman and R. Scott Clark, 62-78. Carlisle: Paternoster Press, 1999.
- _____. "Peter Martyr Vermigli." In *Historical Handbook of Major Biblical Interpreters*, edited by Donald K. McKim, 239-245. Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1998.
- _____. "Peter Martyr Vermigli: Probing his Puritan Influence." In *The Practical Calvinist: An Introduction to the Presbyterian & Reformed Heritage; In honor of Dr. D. Clair Davis*, edited by Peter A. Lillback and D. Clair Davis, 149-160. Fearn, UK: Christian Focus, 2002.
- _____. *Peter Martyr Vermigli and Predestination: The Augustinian Inheritance of an Italian Reformer*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998.
- _____. "Praedestinatio Dei: The Intellectual Origins of Peter Martyr Vermigli's Doctrine of Double Predestination." DPhil. diss., Oxford University, 1993.
- _____. "Romans Commentary: Justification and Sanctification." In *A Companion to Peter Martyr Vermigli*, edited by W. J. Torrance Kirby, Emidio Campi, and Frank A. James, III, 459-465. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- _____. "The Bullinger/Vermigli Axis: Collaborators in Toleration and Reformation." In *Heinrich Bullinger: Life – Thought – Influence: Zurich, Aug. 25-29, 2004; International Congress Heinrich Bullinger (1504-1575)*, edited by Emidio Campi and Peter Opitz, Vol. 1, 165-176. Zurich: Theologischer Verlag Zürich, 2007.
- _____. "The Complex of Justification: Peter Martyr Vermigli Versus Albert Pighius." In *Peter Martyr Vermigli: Humanism, Republicanism, Reformation*, edited by Emidio Campi, Frank A. James, III, and Peter Opitz, 45-58. Geneva: Librairie Droz, 2002.
- Jay, Elisabeth. *The Evangelical and Oxford Movements*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.
- _____. *The Religion of the Heart: Anglican Evangelicalism and the Nineteenth-Century Novel*. Oxford: Clarendon Press 1979.
- Jedin, Hubert. *A History of the Council of Trent*. Translated by Ernest Graf. Vol. 2. London: T. Nelson, 1961.
- _____. "Contarini und Camaldoli." *Archivio Italiano per la Storia della Pieta* 2 (1959): 59-118.
- _____. *Studien über die schriftstellertätigkeit Albert Pigges*. Reformationgeschichtliche Studien und Texte 55. Münster: Aschendorff, 1931.

- Jenkins, Gary. "Peter Martyr and the Church of England after 1558." In *Peter Martyr Vermigli and the European Reformations: Semper Reformanda*, edited by Frank A. James, III. Leiden: Brill, 2004.
- Jewel, John. *The Works of John Jewel, Bishop of Salisbury*. Edited by John Ayre. Vol. 3. Cambridge, UK: The University Press, 1848.
- _____. *The Works of John Jewel, Bishop of Salisbury*. Edited by John Ayre. Vol. 4. Cambridge, UK: The University Press, 1848.
- _____. *The Works of John Jewel, Bishop of Salisbury*. Edited by John Ayre. Vol. 4. Cambridge, UK: The University Press, 1845. Reprint, New York: Johnson Reprints, 1968.
- Johnson, G. "Newman on the Doctrine of Justification." Diss., Pontificia Universita Urbaniana University of Rome, 1946.
- Joint Declaration on the Doctrine of Justification*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000.
- Jost, Walter. *Rhetorical Thought in John Henry Newman*. 1st ed. Columbia, S.C.: University of South Carolina Press, 1989.
- Jung, Eva-Maria. "On the Nature of Evangelism in Sixteenth-century Italy." *Journal of the History of Ideas* 14 (1953): 511-527.
- Ker, Ian T., and Terrence Merrigan. *The Cambridge Companion to John Henry Newman*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.
- Ker, Ian T., and Alan G. Hill. *Newman after a Hundred Years*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990.
- Ker, Ian T. *John Henry Newman: A Biography*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1988.
- _____. *John Henry Newman: A Biography*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.
- _____. *Newman on Being a Christian*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1997.
- _____. *Newman on Being a Christian*. Notre Dame, IN.: University of Notre Dame Press, 1990.
- Ker, Ian T., and Alan G. Hill. *Newman after a Hundred Years*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990.
- Ker, Ian T. *John Henry Newman: A Biography*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1988.
- Ker, Ian T., and Catholic Society (Great Britain). *Newman: his life and legacy*. London: Catholic Truth Society, 2010.
- Ker, Ian T., and Terrence Merrigan. *The Cambridge Companion to John Henry Newman*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.
- Ker, Ian T., and John Henry Newman. *Newman on being a Christian*. Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 1990.
- _____. *Newman the Theologian: A Reader*. London: Collins, 1990.
- King, Benjamin John. *Newman and the Alexandrian Fathers: Shaping Doctrine in Nineteenth-Century England*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.
- Kingdon, Robert M. *The Political Thought of Peter Martyr Vermigli: Selected Texts and Commentary*. Travaux d'humanisme et Renaissance 178. Geneva: Librairie Droz, 1980.

- Knox, Alexander. *Remains of Alexander Knox*. Edited by James John Hornby. 4 vols. London: James Duncan 1834.
- Kristeller, Paul Oskar. *Renaissance Thought: The Classic, Scholastic and Humanist Strains*. New York: Harper & Row, 1961.
- Lane, Anthony N. S. "A Tale of Two Imperial Cities: Justification at Regensburg (1541) and Trent (1546-1547)." In *Justification in Perspective: Historical Developments and Contemporary Challenges*, edited by Bruce L. McCormack, 119-145. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2006.
- _____. "Calvin and Article 5 of the Regensburg Colloquy." In *Calvinus Praeceptor Ecclesiae: Papers of the International Congress on Calvin Research, Princeton, August 20-24, 2002*, edited by Herman J. Selderhuis, 233-263. Geneva: Librairie Droz, 2004.
- _____. "Cardinal Contarini and Article 5 of the Regensburg Colloquy (1541)." In *Grenzgänge der Theologie*. Münster: Lit Verlag, 2004.
- _____. *Justification by Faith in Catholic-Protestant Dialogue: An Evangelical Assessment*. London: T & T Clark, 2002.
- _____. *John Calvin: Student of the Church Fathers*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark and Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1999.
- Latourette, Kenneth Scott. *A History of Christianity*. Rev. ed. Vol. II A.D. 1500-A.D. 1975. San Francisco: Harper San Francisco, 1975.
- Lawrenz, Carl J. "On Justification, Osiander's Doctrine of the Indwelling Christ" " In *No Other Gospel: Essays in Commemoration of the 400th Anniversary of the Formula of Concord 1580-1980*, edited by Arnold J. Koelpin. Milwaukee: Northwestern Publishing House, 1980.
- Lehmann, Karl, Michael Root, and William G. Rusch eds. "Can the Sixteenth Century Condemnations on Justification be Declared Nonapplicable?: An Introduction" in *Justification by Faith: Do the Sixteenth-Century Condemnations Still Apply?* New York: Continuum, 1997
- Lillback, Peter A. "The Early Reformed Covenant Paradigm: Vermigli in the Context of Bullinger, Luther, and Calvin. In *Peter Martyr Vermigli and the European Reformations: Semper Reformanda*, edited by Frank A. James, III. Leiden: Brill, 2004.
- Löwe, J. Andreas. *Richard Smyth and the Language of Orthodoxy: Re-imagining Tudor Catholic Polemicism*. Studies in Medieval and Reformation Thought. Leiden: Brill, 2003.
- Lugioyo, Brian. *Martin Bucer's Doctrine of Justification: Reformation Theology and Early Modern Irenicism*. Oxford Studies in Historical Theology. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.
- Luther, Martin. *What Luther Says, An Anthology*, vol. 3, ed. Ewald M. Plass. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1959.
- MacCulloch, Diarmaid. "Peter Martyr and Thomas Cranmer." In *Peter Martyr Vermigli: Humanism, Republicanism, Reformation*, edited by Emidio Campi, Frank A. James, III, and Peter Opitz. Geneva: Librairie Droz, 2002.

- _____. *The Reformation*. New York: Viking, 2003.
- _____. *Thomas Cranmer: A Life*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1996.
- Mackensen, Heinz. "Contarini's Theological Role at Ratisbon in 1541." *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte* 51 (1960): 36-57.
- Malloy, Christopher J. *Engrafted into Christ: A Critique of the Joint Declaration* 233. New York: Lang, 2005.
- Mant, Richard. *An appeal to the Gospel, or An inquiry into the justice of the charge, alleged by Methodists and other objectors, that the Gospel is not preached by the national clergy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1812.
- Mantova, Benedetto da. *Il Beneficio di Cristo con le versioni del secolo XVI, documenti e testimonianze*. Edited by Salvatore Caponetto. Corpus Reformatorum Italicorum. Florence: G.C. Sansoni, 1972.
- Martin, Brian. *John Henry Newman: His Life and Work*. London: Chatto & Windus, 1982.
- Martin, Greschat. *Martin Bucer: A Reformer and His Times*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2004.
- Martin, John. "Salvation and Society in Sixteenth-century Venice: Popular Evangelism in a Renaissance City." *Journal of Modern History* 60 (1988): 205-233.
- _____. *Venice's Hidden Enemies: Italian Heretics in a Renaissance City*. Studies on the History of Society and Culture 16. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993.
- Matheson, Peter. *Cardinal Contarini at Regensburg*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972.
- _____. *English Church Reform 1815-1840*. London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1923.
- _____. "Martin Bucer and the Old Church." In *Martin Bucer: Reforming Church and Community*, edited by David F. Wright, 5-16. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.
- Mathieson, William Law. *England in Transition, 1789-1832, a Study of Movements*. London: Longmans, Green, and Co, 1920.
- _____. *English Church Reform 1815-1840*. London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1923.
- McConica, James. "The Rise of the Undergraduate College," in *The Collegiate University*, ed. James McConica, Vol 3, *The History of the University of Oxford*, gen. ed. Trevor Henry Aston. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986.
- McGrath, Alister E. "Forerunners of the Reformation? A Critical Examination of the Evidence for Precursors of the Reformation Doctrines of Justification," *Harvard Theological Review* 75 (1982):219-242.
- _____. "Humanist Elements in the Early Reformed Doctrine of Justification." *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte* 73 (1982): 5-20.
- _____. *Iustitia Dei: A History of the Christian Doctrine of Justification*. 3 ed. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ Press, 2005.
- _____. "Newman on Justification: An Evangelical Anglican Evaluation " In *Newman and the Word*, edited by Terrence Merrigan and Ian Ker. Louvain: Peeters, 2000.

- _____. *Reformation Thought: An Introduction*. 4th ed. West Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell, 2012.
- McIlvaine, Charles Pettit. *Oxford divinity compared with that of the Romish and Anglican Churches: with a special view of the doctrine of justification by faith*. London: R.B. Seeley and W. Burnside 1841.
- McLelland, Joseph C. "A Literary History of the *LOCI COMMUNES*." In *A Companion to Peter Martyr Vermigli*, edited by W. J. Torrance Kirby, Emidio Campi, and Frank A. James, III, 459-465. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- _____. "Peter Martyr Vermigli: Scholastic or Humanist?" In *Peter Martyr Vermigli and Italian Reform*, edited by Joseph C. McLelland. Waterloo, Ontario: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1980.
- _____. *Peter Martyr Vermigli and Italian Reform*. Waterloo, ON: Wilfred Laurier University Press, 1980.
- _____. *The Oxford Treatise and Disputation on the Eucharist, 1549*. Translated and Edited by Joseph C. McLelland. The Peter Martyr Library 7. Kirksville, MO: Truman State University Press, 2000.
- _____. "The Reformed Doctrine of Predestination According to Peter Martyr." *Scottish Journal of Theology* 8 (1955): 255-271.
- _____. "Valdés and Vermigli: Spirituality and the Degrees of Reform." In *Peter Martyr Vermigli and the European Reformations: Semper Reformanda*, edited by Frank A. James, III, 238-250. Leiden: Brill, 2004.
- _____. *The Visible Words of God: An Exposition of the Sacramental Theology of Peter Martyr Vermigli, A.D. 1500-1562*. Edinburgh: Oliver & Boyd, 1957.
- McNair, Philip M. J. "Benedetto da Mantova, Marcantonio Flaminio, and the 'Beneficio di Cristo': A Developing Twentieth-century Debate Reviewed." *Modern Language Review* 82, no. 3 (1987): 614-624.
- _____. "Biographical Writings." In *Early Writings: Creed, Scripture and Church. The Peter Martyr Library 1.*, edited by Joseph C. McLelland. Kirksville, MO: Sixteenth Century Journal Publishers, 1994.
- _____. "New Light on Ochino." *Bibliothèque d'humanisme et Renaissance: Travaux et documents* 35 (1973): 289-301.
- _____. "Peter Martyr in England." In *Peter Martyr Vermigli and Italian Reform*, edited by Joseph C. McLelland, viii, 155 p. Waterloo, ON: Wilfred Laurier University Press, 1980.
- _____. *Peter Martyr in Italy: An Anatomy of Apostasy*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1967.
- _____. *Pietro Martire Vermigli in Italia: Un'anatomia di un'apostasia*. Translated by Edoardo Labanchi. Naples: Centro biblico, 1971.
- Medley, Mark. "Participation in God: The Appropriation of Theosis by Contemporary Baptist Theologians." In *Theosis: Deification in Christian Theology*, edited by Vladimir Kharlamov. OR: Pickwick, 2011.

- Melanchthon, Philipp. *Melanchthon on Christian Doctrine: Loci Communes 1555*. Translated and Edited by Clyde L. Manschreck. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1965. Reprint, Grand Rapids: Baker book house, 1982.
- Merrigan, Terrence. "Newman's Progress Towards Rome: A Psychological Consideration of His Conversion to Catholicism." *Downside Review* 104 (1986): 95-112.
- _____. "Numquam Minus Solus, Quam Cum Solus - Newman's First Conversion: Its Significance For His Life and Thought." *Downside Review* 103, no. 351 (1985): 99-116.
- Middleton, R. D. *Newman at Oxford: His Religious Development*. London: Oxford University Press, 1950.
- Miller, Edward Jeremy. *John Henry Newman on the Idea of Church*. Shepherdstown, W.V.: Patmos Press, 1987.
- Milner, Joseph. *The History of the Church of Christ* London: J. and J. Merrill, 1794.
- Moeller, Charles, and Gérard Philips. *The Theology of Grace and the Oecumenical Movement*. Translated by R. A. Wilson. London: Mowbray, 1961.
- Moleski, Martin X. *Personal Catholicism: The Theological Epistemologies of John Henry Newman and Michael Polanyi*. Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 2000.
- Morales, Jose. "Newman and the Problems of Justification." In *Newman Today: Papers Presented at a Conference on John Henry Cardinal Newman*, edited by Stanley L. Jaki, 232 p. San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1989, 143-164.
- Moule, H. C. G. *The Evangelical School in the Church of England: Its Men and Its Work in the Nineteenth Century*. London: J. Nisbet & Co., 1901.
- Mozley, Thomas. *Reminiscences: Chiefly of Oriel College and the Oxford Movement*. 2 vols. London: Longmans, Green, 1882.
- Muller, Richard A. *Christ and the Decree: Christology and Predestination in Reformed Theology from Calvin to Perkins*. Durham, NC: Labyrinth Press, 1986.
- _____. *Dictionary of Latin and Greek Theological Terms*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1985.
- _____. *Post-Reformation Reformed Dogmatics*. 2 vols. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 1987.
- Mullett, Michael A. *The Catholic Reformation*. London: Routledge, 1999.
- Murray, Scott. "Luther in Newman's *Lectures on Justification*." *Concordia Theological Quarterly* 54 (1990): 155-178.
- Neill, Stephen. *A History of Christian Missions*. 2 ed. 6. Middlesex Harmondsworth, 1986.
- Neuhaus, Richard John. "Newman, Luther, and the Unity of Christians " *Pro Ecclesia* 6, no. 3 (1997): 153-193.
- Newman, Francis William. *Contributions chiefly to the early history of the late Cardinal Newman: with comments*. London: K. Paul, Trench, 1891.
- Newman, John Henry. *An Essay in Aid of a Grammar of Assent*. Edited by Charles Fredrick Harrold. New ed. London: Longmans, 1947.

- _____. *An Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine*. 6th ed. Notre Dame, IN.: University of Notre Dame Press, 1989.
- _____. *Apologia pro vita sua: being a history of his religious opinions*. London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1882.
- _____. *Autobiographical Writings*. Edited by Henry Tristram. London Sheed and Ward, 1956.
- _____. *Callista: A Sketch of the Third Century*. New York: D. & J. Sadlier & Co., 1856.
- _____. *Cardinal Newman and William Froude, F. R. S.: a correspondence*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1933.
- _____. *Catholic Sermons of Cardinal Newman, Published for the First Time from the Cardinal's Autograph Manuscripts*. Edited by Birmingham Oratory. London: Burns & Oates, 1957.
- _____. *Certain Difficulties Felt by Anglicans in Catholic Teaching Considered*. 2 vols. London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1908-1914.
- _____. *Lectures on Justification*. London: J.G. Rivington & J.H. Parker, 1838.
- _____. *Lectures on the Doctrine of Justification*. 3rd ed. London: Rivingtons, 1874.
- _____. *Lectures on the prophetical office of the church: viewed relatively to Romanism and popular Protestantism*. 2 ed. London: C. J. G. & F. Rivington, 1838.
- _____. *Letters and Correspondence of John Henry Newman During His Life in the English Church : With a Brief Autobiography*. Edited by Anne Mozley. New impression. ed. 2 vols. London: Longmans, Green, 1903.
- _____. *Letters and Diaries of John Henry Newman* Edited by Charles Stephen Dessain et al. Vol. 4. London: T. Nelson, 1961-1977.
- _____. *Loss and gain: the story of a convert*. London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1898.
- _____. *On Consulting the Faithful in Matters of Doctrine*. Edited by John Coulson. London: G. Chapman, 1961.
- _____. *On the Inspiration of Scripture*. Edited by J. Derek Holmes and Robert Murray. Dublin: G. Chapman, 1967.
- _____. *Parochial and Plain Sermons*. 1 vols. San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1997.
- _____. *The arians of the fourth century: their doctrine, temper, and conduct, chiefly as exhibited in the councils of the church, between A.D. 325, & A.D. 381*. London: C. J. G. & F. Rivington, 1833.
- _____. *The Theological Papers of John Henry Newman on Faith and Certainty*. Edited by J. Derek Holmes and Hugo M. De Achaval. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976.
- _____. *The Via Media of the Anglican Church*. London: Pickering, 1877.
- _____. *Verses on Various Occasions*. New ed. London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1893.
- Newsome, David. "Justification and Sanctification: Newman and the Evangelicals." *Journal of Theological Studies* 15 (1964): 32-53.

- _____. *The Convert Cardinals: John Henry Newman and Henry Edward Manning*. London: John Murray, 1993.
- _____. *The Parting of Friends: The Wilberforces and Henry Manning*. London: Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1966.
- Newton, Bishop Thomas. *Dissertations on the prophecies, which have remarkably been fulfilled, and at this time are fulfilling in the world*. London: J. and R. Tonson and Draper, 1754.
- Newton, John, and Richard Cecil. *Out of the Depths, being the autobiography of John Newton*. 2nd ed. London: C. J. Thynne & Jarvis, 1925.
- Nieto, José C. *Juan de Valdés and the Origins of the Spanish and Italian Reformation*. Travaux d'humanisme et Renaissance 108. Geneva: Librairie Droz, 1970.
- _____. "The Changing Image of Valdés." In *Valdés' Two Catechisms: The Dialogue on Christian Doctrine and the Christian Instruction for Children*, edited by José C. Nieto, translated by William B. Jones and Carol D. Jones, 51-125. Lawrence, KS: Coronado Press, 1993.
- Nockles, Peter Benedict. *The Oxford movement in Context: Anglican High Churchmanship, 1760-1857*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.
- Oberman, Heiko A. *The Dawn of the Reformation*. Essays in Late Medieval and Early Reformation Thought. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1986.
- O'Callaghan, Paul. *Fides Christi: The Justification Debate*. Dublin, Four Courts Press, 1997.
- Ochino, Bernardino. *Fourtene sermons of Barnardine Ochyné, concerning the predestinacion and eleccion of god: very expediente to the settinge forth of hys glorye among hys creatures*. Translated by Anne Cooke Bacon. London: John Day & Wylliam Seres, 1550.
- O'Leary, Joseph S. "Impeded Witness: Newman Against Luther on Justification." In *John Henry Newman: Reason, Rhetoric and Romanticism*, edited by David Nicholls and Fergus Kerr. Bristol: Bristol Press, 1991.
- Olin, John C. *Catholic Reform From Cardinal Ximenes to the Council of Trent 1495-1563: An Essay with Illustrative Documents and a Brief Study of St. Ignatius Loyola*. New York: Fordham University Press, 1990.
- _____. *The Catholic Reformation: Savonarola to Ignatius Loyola; Reform in the Church 1495-1540*. New York: Harper & Row, 1969.
- O'Malley, John W. *Trent: What Happened at the Council*. Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2013.
- _____. *The First Jesuits*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1993.
- Ortolani, Oddone. *Pietro Carnesecchi: Con estratti dagli atti del processo del Santo officio*. Florence: F. Le Monnier, 1963.

- _____. "The Hopes of the Italian Reformers in Roman Action." In *Italian Reformation Studies in Honor of Laelius Socinus*, edited by John A. Tedeschi, 11-20. Florence: Felice Le Monnier, 1965.
- Osiander, Andreas D. A. . "'Eine Disputation von der Rechtfertigung'" In *Gesamtausgabe*, edited by Gerhard Müller and Gottfried Seebaß, Vol. 9. Gütersloh: Gütersloher, 1994.
- Overell, M. Anne. *Italian Reform and English Reformations, c.1535-c.1585*. Catholic Christendom, 1300-1700. Aldershot, UK: Ashgate, 2008.
- _____. "Peter Martyr in England 1547-1553: An Alternative View." *Sixteenth Century Journal* 15, no. 1 (1984): 87-104.
- Overton, John Henry. *The English Church in the Nineteenth Century*. London: Longmans, 1894.
- _____. *The Evangelical Revival in the Eighteenth Century*. London: Longmans, Green, 1886.
- Ozment, Steven E. *The Age of Reform, 1250-1550: An Intellectual and Religious History of Late Medieval and Reformation Europe*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1980.
- Paist, Benjamin F., Jr. "Peter Martyr and the Colloquy of Poissy." *Princeton Theological Review* 20, no. 3 (1922): 418-447.
- Paoletti, John T., and Gary M. Radke. *Art in Renaissance Italy*. New York: Harry N. Abrams, 1997.
- Pastor, Ludwig. *The History of the Popes, from the Close of the Middle Ages: Drawn from the Secret Archives of the Vatican and Other Original Sources*. Translated by Ralph Francis Kerr. Vol. 11. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner, & Co., 1923.
- Paulus, Nikolaus. "Die Stellung der protestantischen Professoren Zanchi und Vermigli zur Gewissensfreiheit." *Katholik* 71 (1891): 201-228.
- Perry, John F. "Newman's Treatment of Luther in the Lectures on Justification." *Journal of Ecumenical Studies* 36 (1999): 303-317.
- Peyronel Rambaldi, Susanna. "Ancora sull'evangelismo italiano: Categoria o invenzione storiografica?" *Società e storia* 5, no. 18 (1982): 935-967.
- Pfeifer, Ludwig. *Ursprung der katholischen Kirche und Zugehörigkeit zur Kirche nach Albert Pigge*. Würzburg: Rita Verlag, 1938.
- Pickering, W. S. F. *Anglo-Catholicism: A Study in Religious Ambiguity*. London: Routledge, 1989.
- Pighius, Albertus. *Controversiarum praecipuarum in Comitiis Ratisponensibus ...tractarum et quibus nunc...exagitur Christi fides et religio religio, diligens, et luculenta explicatio*. Paris: Apud Viuantium Gaulterot, 1549.
- _____. *De libero hominis arbitrio & divina gratia, libri decem, nunc primum in lucem editi*. Cologne: Ex officina Melchioris Novensiani, 1542.
- Pope Benedict XVI. *Saint Paul*. San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 2009.

- Popov, Ivan. "The Idea of Deification in the Early Eastern Church." In *Theosis: Deification in Christian Theology*, edited by Vladimir Kharlamov. OR: Pickwick, 2011.
- Prelowski, Ruth. "The *Beneficio di Cristo*, Translated with an Introduction." In *Italian Reformation Studies in Honor of Laelius Socinus (1562-1962)*, edited by John A. Tedeschi, 21-102. Florence: Felice Le Monnier, 1965.
- Prosperi, Adriano. *Tra evangelismo e controriforma: G. M. Giberti (1495-1543)*. Uomini e dottrine 16. Rome: Edizioni di storia e letteratura, 1969.
- Pusey, E. B. *A letter to the Right Rev. Father in God, Richard Lord Bishop of Oxford, on the tendency to Romanism imputed to doctrines held of old, as now, in the English Church*. 2nd ed. Oxford: J. H. Parker, 1839.
- Rambo, Lewis R. *Understanding Religious Conversion*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1993.
- Rando, John A. *Lutheran & Catholic Reconciliation on Justification*. Grand Rapids; Eerdmans, 2009.
- Reynolds, J. S. *The Evangelicals at Oxford, 1735-1871: A Record of an Unchronicled Movement with the Record Extended to 1905*. Oxford: Marcham Manor Press, 1975.
- Richgels, Robert W. "The Pattern of Controversy in a Counter-reformation Classic: The Controversies of Robert Bellarmine." *Sixteenth Century Journal* 11, no. 2 (1980): 3-15.
- Robbins, William. *The Newman Brothers: An Essay in Comparative Intellectual Biography*. Cambridge Harvard University Press, 1966.
- Rondet, Henri. *The Grace of Christ: A Brief History of the Theology of Grace*. Westminster, MD.: Newman Press, 1967.
- Ross, James Bruce. "Gasparo Contarini and His Friends." *Studies in the Renaissance* 17 (1970): 204-217.
- _____. "The Emergence of Gasparo Contarini: A Bibliographic Essay." *Church History: Studies in Christianity and Culture* 41, no. 1 (1972): 22-45.
- Rowell, Geoffrey. *The Vision Glorious : Themes and Personalities of the Catholic Revival in Anglicanism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1983.
- Ruggles, Eleanor. *Journey into Faith: the Anglican life of John Henry Newman*. 1st ed. New York: W.W. Norton, 1948.
- Russell, George William Erskine. *The household of faith : portraits and essays*. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1902.
- Ryle, J. C. *Knots untied being plain statements on disputed points in religion from the standpoint of an evangelical churchman*. London: National Protestant Church Union, 1898.
- Ryle, J. C., and C. Sydney Carter. *Knots untied : being plain statements on disputed points in religion from an evangelical standpoint*. 31st ed. London: James Clark, 1954.

- Sambin, Paolo. "La formazione quattrocentesca della biblioteca di S. Giovanni di Verdara in Padova." *Atti dell'Istituto Veneto di Scienze Lettere ed Arti, Classe di scienze morali e lettere* 114 (1956): 263-280.
- Santini, Luigi. "Appunti sulla ecclesiologia di P. M. Vermigli e la edificazione della Chiesa." *Bolletino della società di studi Valdési* 104 (1958): 69-75.
- _____. "La Tesi della fuga nella persecuzione nella teologia di P. M. Vermigli." *Bolletino della società di studi Valdési* 108 (1960): 37-49.
- Schaff, Philip. "Periodization of Sixteenth-century Italian Religious History: The Post-Cantimori Paradigm Shift." *Journal of Modern History* 61 (1989): 269-284.
- _____. *The History of Creeds*. 4th ed. The Creeds of Christendom, with a History and Critical Notes 1. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1877.
- Schenk, Wilhelm. *Reginald Pole, Cardinal of England*. London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1950.
- Schlosser, Friedrich Christoph. *Leben des Theodor de Beza und des Peter Martyr Vermigli: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Zeiten der Kirchen-Reformation*. Heidelberg: Mohr und Zimmer, 1809.
- Schmidt, Charles. *Peter Martyr Vermigli: Leben und ausgewählte Schriften nach handschriftlichen und gleichzeitigen Quellen*. Elberfeld: R.L. Friderichs, 1858.
- Schmitt, Charles B. "Towards a Reassessment of Renaissance Aristotelianism." *History of Science* 11 (1973): 159-193.
- Schutte, Anne Jacobson. "Periodization of Sixteenth-century Italian Religious History: The Post-Cantimori Paradigm Shift." *Journal of Modern History* 61 (1989): 269-284.
- _____. "The *Lettere Volgari* and the Crisis of Evangelism in Italy." *Renaissance Quarterly* 28 (1975): 639-688.
- Scott, Thomas. *Essays on the most important subjects in religion* Fourth ed. London: D. Jaques, Lower Sloan-Street, 1800.
- _____. *Remarks on the refutation of calvinism*. Second Edition ed. London: A. Macintosh 1817.
- _____. *The Works of the Late Rev. Thomas Scott*. Edited by John Scott. London: Thames Ditton, 1823.
- Seebaß, Gottfried *Das reformatorische Werk des Andreas Osiander*. Vol. 44. Einzelarbeiten aus der Kirchengeschichte Bayerns. Nuremberg: Mohr, 1967.
- Seeberg, Reinhold *Textbook of the History of Doctrines* Translated by Charles E Hay. Vol. 2. History of Doctrines in the Ancient Church. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1958.
- Sheridan, Thomas L. *Newman on Justification: A Theological Biography*. New York: Alba House, 1967.
- _____. "Newman and Luther on Justification." *Journal of Ecumenical Studies* 38:2-3 (2001): 217-245.
- _____. *The Cambridge Companion to John Henry Newman*. Edited by Ian Ker and Terrence Merrigan. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.

- Short, Edward. *Newman and His Contemporaries*. New York: T&T Clark, 2011.
- Simler, Josias. *Life, Letters, and Sermons*. Translated and Edited by John Patrick Donnelly. The Peter Martyr Library 5. Kirksville, MO: Thomas Jefferson University Press, 1999.
- _____. *Oratio de vita et obitu clarissimi viri et præstantissimi theologi D. Petri Martyris Vermilii divinarum literarum professoris in schola Tigurina*. Zurich: Apud Christophorum Froschouerum iuniorem, 1563.
- Simoncelli, Paolo. *Evangelismo italiano del cinquecento: Questione religiosa e Nicodemismo politico*. Italia e Europa. Rome: Istituto storico italiano per l'età moderna e contemporanea, 1979.
- _____. "Nuove ipotesi e studi sul *Beneficio di Cristo*." *Critica storica* 12 (1975): 320-388.
- Simuț, Corneliu C. *The Doctrine of Salvation in the Sermons of Richard Hooker*. Arbeiten zur Kirchengeschichte 94. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2005.
- _____. *Richard Hooker and His Early Doctrine of Justification: A Study of His Discourse of Justification*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2005.
- Sleidan, John. *The general history of the Reformation of the Church, from the errors and corruptions of the Church of Rome: Begun in Germany by Martin Luther, with the progress thereof in all parts of Christendom, from the year 1517, to the year 1556*. Translated by Edmund Bohun. London: Edward Jones, Abel Swall, and Henry Bonwicke, 1689.
- Smith, Richard. *De coelibatu sacerdotum liber vnus. Eiusdem de votis monasticis liber alter, nunc primum typis excusi*. Lovanii: Apud Ioannem Waen, 1550.
- _____. *Diatriba de hominis iustificatione...adversus P.M. Vermelinum* Lovanii: Antonius Maria Bergaigne, 1550.
- Smyth, Charles. *Simeon & Church Order: A Study of the Origins of the Evangelical Revival in Cambridge in the Eighteenth Century*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1940.
- Steinmetz, David C. *Reformers in the Wings*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1971.
- _____. "The Intellectual Appeal of the Reformation" *Theology Today* 57 (2001) 459-472.
- Stephens, W. P. *The Holy Spirit in the Theology of Martin Bucer*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970.
- Storr, Vernon F. *The Development of English Theology in the Nineteenth Century, 1800-1860*. London: Longmans, Green and co., 1913.
- Strange, Roderick. *Newman and the Gospel of Christ*. Oxford Theological Monographs. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1981.
- Strype, John. *Annals of the Reformation and establishment of religion: And other various occurrences in the Church of England during Queen Elizabeth's happy reign, together with an appendix of original papers of state, records, and letters*. Vol. 1 pt. 1. 4 vols. London: John Wyat, 1709. Reprint, New York: Burt Franklin, 1966.
- Stupperich, Martin. *Osiander in Preußen, 1549-1552*. Vol. 44. Arbeiten zur Kirchengeschichte Berlin: De Graaf, 1973.

- Sturm, Klaus. *Die Theologie Peter Martyr Vermigli während seines ersten Aufenthalts in Strasbourg 1542-1547: Ein Reformkatholik unter den Vätern der reformierten Kirche*. Beiträge zur Geschichte und Lehre der Reformierten Kirche. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1971.
- Sumner, John Bird. *Apostolical preaching considered, in an examination of St. Paul's Epistles*. London: J. Hatchard and Son, 1815.
- Tacchi Venturi, Pietro. *Storia della Compagnia di Gesù in Italia*. Vol. 1. 2 vols. Rome: La Civiltà cattolica, 1950.
- Tailepied, Noël. *Histoire de vies, meurs, actes, doctrine et morts des quatre principaux Hérétiques de nostra temps*. Paris: Chez Jean Parent, 1580.
- Tanner, N.P. (ed.), *Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils*. 2 Vols. London: Sheed & Ward, and Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 1990.
- Tedeschi, John. *The Italian Reformation of the Sixteenth Century and the Diffusion of Renaissance Culture: A Bibliography of the Secondary Literature (ca. 1750-1997)*, Modena: Panini; Ferrara: ISR, 2000.
- Testa, Michael. "The Theological Anthropology of John Henry Newman." Ph.D. Diss., St. Louis University, 1993.
- The Book of Concord: The Confession of the Evangelical Lutheran Church*. Ed. Theodore Gerhardt Tappert. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1959.
- The Catechism of the Council of Trent*. Translated by Rev. J. Donovan. London: Keating and Brown, 1829.
- The Lutheran World Federation and The Roman Catholics Church, *Joint Declaration on the Doctrine of Justification*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000.
- Thomas, Stephen. *Newman and Heresy: The Anglican Years*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.
- Toon, Peter. "A Critical Review of John Henry Newman's Doctrine of Justification " *Churchman* 94, no. 4 (1980): 335-344.
- _____. *Evangelical Theology, 1833-1856: A Response to Tractarianism*. London: Marshall, Morgan and Scott, 1979.
- Townsend, Ralph "The Catholic Revival in the Church of England." In *The Study of Spirituality*, edited by Cheslyn Jones, 1 online resource (xxix, 634 p., 16 p. of plates) ill. Oxford Oxford University Press, 1986.
- Trevor, Meriol. *Newman: Light in Winter*. Vol. 2. 2 vols. London: Macmillan & Co., 1962.
- _____. *Newman: The Pillar of the Cloud*. Vol. 1. 2 vols. London: Macmillan & Co., 1962.
- Tristram, Henry. *Newman and his friends*. London: John Lane, 1933.
- Turner, Frank M. *John Henry Newman: The Challenge to Evangelical Religion*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2002.
- Valdés, Juan de. "La epístola de San Pablo a los Romanos." In *Reformistas antiguos españoles*, edited by Luis de Usó y Ríos, Vol. 10-11. Madrid, 1856. Reprint, Barcelona: Librería de Diego Gómez Flores, 1982.

- _____. *Valdés' Two Catechisms: The Dialogue on Christian Doctrine and the Christian Instruction for Children*. Edited by José C. Nieto. Translated by William B. Jones and Carol D. Jones. Lawrence, KS: Coronado Press, 1981.
- Valdés, Juan de, and Don Benedetto. *The Benefit of Christ: Living Justified Because of Christ's Death*. Edited by James M. Houston. Vancouver: Regent College Publishing, 2003.
- Vasoli, Cesare. "Loci Communes and the Rhetorical and Dialectical Traditions." In *Peter Martyr Vermigli and Italian Reform*, edited by Joseph C. McLelland, viii, 155 p. Waterloo, ON: Wilfred Laurier University Press, 1980.
- Vermigli, Pietro Martire. *In epistolam S. Pauli apostoli ad Romanos D. Petri Martyris Vermilii Florentini, professoris divinarum literarum in schola Tigurina, commentarii doctissimi, cum tractatione perutili rerum & locorum, qui ad eam epistolam pertinent*. Basel: Apud Petrum Perna, 1560 (first edition 1558).
- _____. *In primum librum Mosis, qui vulgo Genesis dicitur, commentarii doctissimi D. Petri Martyris Vermilii Florentini, professoris divinarum literarum in schola Tigurina, nunc denuo in lucem editi*. Zurich: Christophorus Froschouerus, 1579 (first edition 1569).
- _____. *In Selectissimam D. Pauli Apostoli Priorem Ad Corinthios Epistolam Commentarii*. Zurich: Christophorum Froschouerus, 1579 (first edition, 1551).
- _____. *Una Semplice Dichiaratione sopra gli XII Articola della Fede Christiana*. Basel: John Hervagius, 1544.
- Vermigli, Peter Martyr. *Commentary on Aristotle's Nicomachean Ethics*. Translated and Edited by Emidio Campi and Joseph C. McLelland. The Peter Martyr Library 9. Kirksville, MO: Truman State University Press, 2006.
- _____. *Commentary on Lamentations of the Prophet Jeremiah*. Translated and Edited by Daniel John Shute. The Peter Martyr Library 6. Kirksville, MO: Truman State University Press, 2002.
- _____. *Dialogue on the Two Natures in Christ*. Translated and Edited by John Patrick Donnelly. The Peter Martyr Library 2. Kirksville, MO: Thomas Jefferson University Press, 1995.
- _____. *Early Writings: Creed, Scripture, Church*. Translated and Edited by Mariano Di Gangi and Joseph C. McLelland. The Peter Martyr Library 1. Kirksville, MO: Thomas Jefferson University Press, 1994.
- _____. "Letter CCXXXII, Peter Martyr to Henry Bullinger." In *Original Letters Relative to the English Reformation, 1531-1558*, edited by Hastings Robinson, Vol. 2. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1846-1847.
- _____. *Life, Letters, and Sermons*. Translated and Edited by John Patrick Donnelly. The Peter Martyr Library 5. Kirksville, MO: Thomas Jefferson University Press, 1999.
- _____. *Philosophical Works: On the Relation of Philosophy to Theology*. Translated and Edited by Joseph C. McLelland. The Peter Martyr Library 4. Kirksville, MO: Truman State University Press, 1996.

- _____. *Predestination and Justification: Two Theological Loci*. Translated and Edited by Frank A. James, III. The Peter Martyr Library 8. Kirksville, MO: Truman State University Press, 2003.
- _____. *Sacred Prayers Drawn from the Psalms of David*. Translated and Edited by John Patrick Donnelly. The Peter Martyr Library 3. Kirksville, MO: Thomas Jefferson University Press, 1996.
- _____. *The Oxford Treatise and Disputation on the Eucharist, 1549*. Translated and Edited by Joseph C. McLelland. The Peter Martyr Library 7. Kirksville, MO: Truman State University Press, 2000.
- _____. *The Peter Martyr Reader*. Edited by John Patrick Donnelly, Frank A. James, III, and Joseph C. McLelland. Kirksville, MO: Truman State University Press, 1999.
- Vermigli, Pietro Martire, Josias Simmler, Anthony Marten, Henry Denham, Henry Middleton, Thomas Chard, William Broome, and Andrew Maunsell. *The common places of the most famous and renowned diuine Doctor Peter Martyr: diuided into foure principall parts: with a large addition of manie theologicall and necessarie discourses, some neuer extant before*. Translated by Anthonie Marten. London: Henry Denham and Henry Middleton, 1583.
- Vinay, Valdo. "Die Schrift 'Il Beneficio di Giesu Cristo' und ihre Verbreitung in Europa nach der neueren Forschung." *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte* 58 (1967): 29-72.
- Walgrave, Jan Hendrik. *Newman the Theologian: the Nature of Belief and Doctrine as Exemplified in His Life and Works*. Translated by A. V. Littledale. London: G. Chapman, 1960.
- Ward, Maisie. *Young Mr. Newman*. London: Sheed & Ward, 1948.
- Ward, Wilfrid. *The Life of John Henry Cardinal Newman: Based on His Private Journals and Correspondence*. 2 vols. London Longmans, Green, and Co, 1912.
- Wiffen, Benjamin B., and Juan de Valdés. *Life and Writings of Juan de Valdés, otherwise Valdesso, Spanish Reformer in the Sixteenth Century*. Translated by John T. Betts. London: Trubner and Co., Ludgate Hill, 1882.
- Williams, Rowan. *Arius: Heresy and Tradition*. London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1987.
- Wood, Anthony à. *Athenae Oxonienses: An exact history of all the writers and bishops who have had their education in the University of Oxford: to which are added the Fasti, or Annals of the said University*. 2 ed. Vol. 1. 2 vols. London: F. C. and J. Rivington et al.
- Wright, T. R. *John Henry Newman: a man for our time?* Newcastle upon Tyne: Grevatt & Grevatt, 1983.
- Yarnold, Edward. "Duplex iustitia: The Sixteenth Century and the Twentieth." In *Christian Authority: Essays in Honour of Henry Chadwick*, edited by G. R. Evans, 204-223. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1988.
- Young, Marianne. *The Life and Times of Aonio Paleario, or A history of the Italian Reformers in the Sixteenth Century*. 2 vols. London: Bell and Daldy, 1860.

Zanchi, Girolamo. *De religione christiana fides – Confession of Christian Religion*. Edited by Luca Baschera and Christian Moser. Vol. 1. 2 vols. Studies in the History of Christian Traditions 135. Leiden: Brill, 2007.

Zuidema, Jason. *Peter Martyr Vermigli (1499-1562) and the Outward Instruments of Divine Grace*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2008.

_____. "Flight from Persecution and the Honour of God in the Theology of Peter Martyr Vermigli." *Reformation and Renaissance Review* 15, no. 1 (2013): 112-116.